N080-630 ERIC REPORT RESUME

ED 010 111 1-09-67 24 (REV)
SOCIAL EFFECTS OF EDUCATION ON CHILDREN OF SUBURBAN BLUE COLLAR WORKERS.
STOUT, ROBERT T.
CTY09354 UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
CRP-S-247
BR-T-8129
 - -66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$8.04 201P.

SOCIAL CLASS, *SOCIOECONOMIC INFLUENCES, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *PARENT ROLE, SOCIAL BACKGROUND, FRIENDSHIP, *ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES, BLUE-COLLAR OCCUPATIONS, ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, HIGH ACHIEVERS, QUESTION-ANSWER INTERVIEW, *PARENT INFLUENCE, SOCIAL RELATIONS, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AN EXPLORATION OF THE EFFECTS OF LIFE CIRCUMSTANCES (SOCIAL CLASSES), DEFINED WITH REFERENCE TO FOUR ENVIRONMENTS, ON A PERSON'S SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION WAS THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY. THE FOUR ENVIRONMENTS USED WERE--(1) MAN'S SOCIAL BACKGROUND, (2) MAN'S FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS, (3) THE WORK ENVIRONMENT, AND (4) VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES IN NONWORK ORGANIZATIONS. CAUCASIAN "BLUE-COLLAR" FATHERS HAVING CHILDREN IN HIGH SCHOOL WERE SELECTED FOR STUDY. EACH OF THESE FATHERS HAD AT LEAST ONE WHO--(1) HAD ATTENDED ONLY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, (2) WAS IN THE UPPER HALF OF HIS CLASS ACADEMICALLY, AND (3) WAS ENROLLED IN THE 10TH, 11TH, OR 12TH GRADE. INTRODUCTORY LETTERS AND FOLLOWUP AND PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WERE USED FOR THE DATA-GATHERING EXERCISE. THE FINAL SUBJECT GROUP CONTAINED OVER 330 RESPONDENTS, OR ABOUT 80 PERCENT OF THE ORIGINAL SAMPLE. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY WERE THAT--(1) INFLUENCE EXERTED BY A "HIGH-STATUS" FRIEND OR NEIGHBOR APPEARS TO BE CONDITIONED BY A DESIRE TO ACCEPT THE POTENTIAL INFLUENCE, (2) A WORKING CLASS CHILD WHO ATTENDS A MIDDLE-CLASS HIGH SCHOOL IS MORE LIKELY TO ENTER COLLEGE THAN ONE ATTENDING A WORKING CLASS HIGH SCHOOL, (3) STYLE OF LIFE DID NOT APPEAR RELEVANT AS A DISTINGUISHER AMONG "BLUE-COLLAR" AND "WHITE-COLLAR" WORKERS, EXCEPT AS THE CONCEPT BECOMES REDEFINED FROM AN EXCLUSIVE USE OF OUTWARD SYMBOLS TO AN INCLUSION OF PATTERNS OF INTERPERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS. (HB)

S-247
58129

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF EDUCATION ON CHILDREN OF SUBURBAN BLUE COLLAR WORKERS

Cooperative Research Project No. 5-8129-2-12-1

Robert T. Stout

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED 010 111

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS ix

Chapter
I. THE BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . 1

Introduction
Background of the Problem
Statement of the Problem

II. THE PLAN OF THE STUDY 28
The Setting
T
The Sample
Instruments
The Variables

III. THE FINDINGS: ATTITUDES 60
Introduction
The Findings
Summary

IV. THE FINDINGS: BEHAVIOR 104
Summary

V. DISCUSSION 136
The Findings
Implications
Toward Further Research
Implications for Education

APPENDIX A 154

APPENDIX B 175

BIBLIOGRAPHY 180

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Housing and Growth Patterns of Bremen Township 29
2. Income and Occupation of Bremen Township 30
3. Percentage Distributions Among Blue Collar Categories. 31
4. Reasons Given for Non-Interviews 35
5. Distribution of Prestige Scores for Respondents and Non-Respondents 37
6. Mean Job Prestige Scores for Selected Blue Collar Groups in Bremen Township 38
7. Unrotated Factor Matrix for 23 Attitude Items . . . 45
8. Three-Factor Varimax Rotational Solution for Total Sample 46
9. Factor I, Items and Item Loadings 47
10. Distribution of Individual Scores on Attitudes Toward College-Going 49
11. Percent of Fathers Able to Name Unsuitable Colleges For Their Children 61
12. Percent of Fathers Having No Positive Choice Of College 61
13. Positive College Choices of Fathers of Twelfth Grade Students 62
14. Percent of Fathers Able To Identify: (Three Pre-College Services) 63
15. Percent of Fathers Having Made No Plans 64
16. Relationship Between Educational Level and Attitudes Toward College-Going 68
17. Relationship Between Educational Level and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys 69
18. Relationship Between Educational Level and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls . . 69

Table Page

19. Relationship Between Educational Level and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Standardized on Occupational Prestige 70

20. Relationship Between Educational Level and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Standardized on Foreman Status 72

21. Relationship Between Education of Respondent's Wife and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys and Girls 73

22. Relationship Between Occupation of Respondent's Father and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling for Educational Level of Respondent 75

23. Relationship Between Occupation of Respondent's Father and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls, Controlling for Educational Level of Respondent 75

24. Relationship Between Status of Friend and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among All Respondents, Controlling for the Educational Level of the Respondent 77

25. Relationship Between Status of Friend and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling for the Educational Level of the Respondent 78

26. Percentage of Men Who Have High Attitudes Among Those Who Have: (Education and Status of Friend Compared) 79

27. Relationship Between Status of Friend and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls, Controlling for the Educational Level of the Respondent 79

28. Relationship Between the Status of the Neighbor and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling for the Educational Level of the Respondent 80

29. Relationship Between the Status of the Neighbor and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls, Controlling for the Educational Level of the Respondent 81

30. Relationship Between the Status of the Neighbor and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling for the Length of Residence Within the Suburb 83

Table Page

31. Relationship Between On The Job Interaction with White Collar Workers and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) . 84

32. Relationship Between Foreman Status and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) 86

33. Relationship Between Foreman Status and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling for Educational Level of Respondent . 87

34. Relationship Between Job Content and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) . 88

35. Relationship Between Job Content and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls, Standardized Educational Level and Foremanship 89

36. Percentage of Fathers of Boys Expressing Positive Attitudes Toward College-Going Among those Who Have :(Education and Job Content Compared). . 89

37. Relationship Between Level of Income and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys . . . 91

38. Relationship Between Level of Income and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls . . . 91

39. Relationship Between Occupational Prestige Score and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys, Standardized on Educational Level of Respondent 92

40. Relationship Between Occupational Prestige Score and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls 93

41. Relationship Between Security of Position and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Boys . . . 94

42. Relationship Between Security of Position and Attitudes Toward College-Going Among Fathers of Girls . . . 94

43. Relationship Between Attitudes Toward College-Going and Four Selected Variables Among Fathers of Boys . 96

44. Relationship Between Attitudes Toward College-Going and Three Selected Variables Among Fathers of Girls 98

45. Relationship Between Activity Index and Status of Friend, Standardized on Education, Status of Neighbor, Job Content and Foremanship 100

Table Page

46. Relationship Between Activity Index and Status of Neighbor, Standardized on Education, Status of Friend, Job Content and Foremanship. . . . 100

47. Relationship Between Attitudes Toward College-Going and Supportive Behavior Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) 105

48. Relationship Between Attitudes Toward College-Going and Supportive Behavior Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling on Educational Level of Respondent . 106

49. Relationship Between Attitudes Toward College-Going and Supportive Behavior Among Fathers of Girls, Controlling on Educational Level of Respondent . . 107

50. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Educational Level Among All Respondents, Controlling for Attitudes Toward College-Going 108

51. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Education of Respondent's Wife Among Fathers of Boys 109

52. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Education of Respondent's Wife Among Fathers of Girls 109

53. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Occupation of Respondent's Father 110

54. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Status of Respondent's Best Friend, Standardized on Educational Level of Respondent 111

55. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and the Status of the Best Friend, Holding Attitudes Toward College-Going Constant 112

56. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and the Status of the Neighbor, Standardized on the Educational Level of the Respondent 113

57. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and the Status of the Neighbor, Holding Attitudes Toward College-Going Constant 114

58. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Combined Status of Friend and Neighbor, Holding Attitudes Toward College-Going Constant 114

59. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and On The Job Interaction Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) . 115

Table Page

60. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and On The Job Interaction Among Fathers of Boys, Controlling for Formal Work Authority as Represented by Foremanship Status 116

61. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Foremanship Status Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) 117

62. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Foremanship Status Among Fathers of Boys, Holding Educational Level of Respondent Constant . 119

63. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Foremanship Status Among Fathers of Boys Without a Full High School Education, Holding Constant Attitudes Toward College-Going 119

64. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Job Content Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) . . . 120

65. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Job Content Among Fathers of Boys, Standardized on Educational Level of Respondent 121

66. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Income Level Among Fathers of: (Boys and Girls) . . . 122

67. Percentage of Respondents Reporting High Supportive Behavior Among Those Who Have Sons and: (Education, Attitudes and Income Compared) . . . 123

68. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Occupational Prestige Scores Among Fathers of Boys 124

69. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Occupational Prestige Scores Among Fathers of Girls 124

70. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Four Selected Variables Among Fathers of Girls . . . 126

71. Weighted Effects on Supportive Behavior Among Fathers of Girls of Respondent Attributes . . . 127

72. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Four Selected Variables Among Fathers of Boys 128

73. Weighted Effects on Supportive Behavior Among Fathers of Boys of Respondent Attributes 129

Table Page

74. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Four Selected Variables Among Fathers of Boys 130

75. Unweighted Effects on Supportive Behavior Among Fathers of Boys of Respondent Attributes 131

76. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Organizational Membership, Standardized on Education of Respondent and the Statuses of His Friend and His Neighbor 132

77. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Organizational Membership, Holding Constant Attitudes of Respondent 132

78. Relationship Between Supportive Behavior and Organizational Membership Holding Constant the Status of the Neighbor. 133

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure Page

1. Symbolic Representation of Hypothesized Relationship Between Social Background and Support for College-Going 20

2. Symbolic Representation of Hypothesized Relationship Between the Informal Social Environment and Support for College-Going 21

3. Symbolic Representation of Hypothesized Relationship Between On The Job Interaction Patterns and Support for College-Going 22

4. Symbolic Representation of Hypothesized Relationship Between Job Content and Support for College-Going 23

5. Symbolic Representation of Hypothesized Relationships Between the Negotiable Components of an Occupation and Support for College-Going 25

6. Symbolic Representation of Hypothesized Relationship Between Participation in Voluntary Non-Work Organizations and Support for College-Going . . . 26

7. Statistically Significant Relationships Classified By Sex of Child and Dependent Variable 143

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Modern American society is highly industrialized, and, as a consequence, exhibits a complex set of differentiated work roles. Each of these work roles has attached to it social rewards in the form of income, prestige and access to other social rewards. As a result, there are large groups of persons which share unequally in the distribution of total social benefits. These groups also tend to dispose of whatever benefits they receive in dissimilar fashions. Thus, there exist groups with different and distinct life styles, or, what have been called social classes. It has been argued that in a society so stratified "occupation is one of the most important determinants of stratification in the American Urban Community."[1] It has also been argued that occupation, as a determinant of one's place in the social stratification system, contributes in large measure to attitude formation and behavior. Inkeles has said, "It is assumed that people have experiences, develop attitudes, and form values in response to the forces or pressures which their environment creates."[2] The work role, by controlling access to social rewards, must therefore play a significant part in defining the boundaries of any environment. Further, an assumption is made that the same situational pressures will be experienced as similar by most persons, and will generate the same or similar responses to them. Occupation, then, contributes to attitude formation and behavior, by creating life circumstances, which in turn generate values, attitudes and behavior. Thus, persons in similar occupations would be expected to view their social worlds in a comparable manner, different from persons in dissimilar occupations. The attitudes and values of blue collar workers are expected, therefore, to be unlike those of white collar workers. Behavior patterns will generally reflect these dissimilar values and attitudes, in so far as the behavior does not violate general cultural norms.

---

[1] Edward O. Laumann, "Subjective Social Distance and Urban Occupational Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, 71 (July 1965) p. 26.

[2] Alex Inkeles, "Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception, and Value," American Journal of Sociology, 66 (July 1960) p. 2

Most of the research involving blue collar workers has been conducted in blue collar neighborhoods of large cities. But as cities have come to be predominant in American life, urban peripheries have experienced tremendous population gains, particularly since World War II. As a result of increased availability of suburban housing, and more recently, as a result of industrial relocation, blue collar workers have participated in the migration from the central city. Consequently, the suburban blue collar dweller has increasingly become the object of investigation.

This study is an attempt to explore certain environmental presses on suburban blue collar workers in order to relate them to expressed attitudes and subsequent behavior in support of a college education for their children. The desire to study suburban blue collar workers has placed certain restrictions on what was considered to be an available population. A suburban blue collar worker who resides in his own single-family dwelling is qualitatively different from the inner city worker who experiences a high degree of job turn-over and who is barely able to pay rent to an apartment owner. The population from which this sample is drawn therefore probably represents the upper half of the blue collar work force in terms of income level and occupational security.[1] If the suburban blue collar worker values education for his children he may represent a departure from his traditional city brother and the value discrepancy may be related to a perceived, or real, difference in his position in the social stratification scheme.

Background of the Problem

Centers' work demonstrates that a majority of the blue collar workers he studied thought it more important to guarantee a decent and steady job and subsequent standard of living to every person than to make certain that there exist good opportunities for personal advancement.[2] Riessman shows that blue collar workers are reluctant to make personal sacrifices in order to take a new, and ostensibly better, position.[3]

A corollary to the described phenomenon of reluctance to take risks is the blue collar worker's general desire for a stable life style. Miller and Riessman argue that "success" for blue collar workers mean a comfortable way of life, rather than prestige or social mobility, and that one of the basic themes of the "working class subculture" is a striving for stability and security.[4] Gans discusses what he terms the "routine seekers" among the working class in Boston's West End.[1] Further, even his "internally mobile members," those whose advanced education or professional skills are exercised within the West End and for the group, desired the stability brought about by routinized interaction patterns and regularized personal behavior. Kornhauser argues that the workers in his sample desired respectability more than mobility.[2] It thus appears that blue collar workers may desire mobility only to the point at which their lives are stable and comfortable, preferring at this time to solidify the relative predictability of the status quo.

---

[1] I hope to show that even within this relatively homogeneous occupational group there is variation in attitudes and behavior which can be accounted for by the variables I have chosen.

[2] Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949).

[3] Leonard Riessman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, 18, 3 (June 1953) pp. 233-42.

[4] S. M. Miller and Frank Riessman, "Are Workers Middle Class?" Dissent, 8, 4, pp. 507-13, p. 516.

A third pattern which has emerged from studies of blue collar workers concerns the role of education in their lives. Miller and Riessman argue that even though blue collar workers desire education for their children, they feel alienated from the teachers and the school.[3] The resulting ambivalence is well-documented,[4] and includes such conflicting beliefs as the following: school should assure occupational success, but teachers are not to be trusted since they represent authority; college-going is necessary, but the cost represents a major risk to family stability; and finally, the school represents an environment based on abstraction and is therefore alien to the concrete world of the blue collar worker. The ambivalence may be stated in Cohen's[1] terms as one of both fearing and desiring the perceived probable outcome of the education process. In other words, "a belief that college is the only path to success may coexist with the belief that college involves estrangement from the family for a working class boy."[2] Such ambivalence may be partially resolved by cognitively restricting the school's role to the obvious, the utility-oriented and the predictable.

---

[1] Herbert Gans, The Urban Villagers (New York: The Free Press, 1962) pp. 28-31 and pp. 197-226.

[2] Arthur Kornhauser, et.al., When Labor Votes (New York: University Books, 1956).

[3] S. M. Miller and Frank Riessman, "The Working Class Sub Culture: A New View," Social Problems, 9, 1, pp. 86-97.

[4] See for instance Herbert Gans, op.cit., p. 236, for several citations of cross-culture research.

The above research themes of reluctance to take risks, desire for a stable life pattern, and feeling of ambivalence toward the school seem to discriminate effectively blue collar workers from white collar workers. But variation within each of these two broad occupational categories may be relatively great. Certainly the variation in income and life styles between unskilled migratory workers and skilled industrial workers is large, although both groups could be categorized as blue collar. Consequently, a microsociological level of analysis may reveal interesting variation among members of the broadly classified "blue collar" group. In this dissertation a relatively homogeneous occupational group, blue collar workers who can be classified as stable, or as "solid citizens," will be examined. An attempt will be made to determine whether within this group the operation of sociological phenomena which are less macro than occupational prestige or income, have any power to explain differential behavior.

---

[1] Elizabeth G. Cohen, "Parental Factors in Educational Mobility," Sociology of Education, 38,5 (Fall 1965) p. 405.

[2] Elizabeth G. Cohen, ibid.

Research workers interested in stratification have studied differences among persons who, by virtue of similar occupation, life styles or attitudes, are thought to be members of the same social class. Kahl discovered that blue collar workers who encourage their sons to attend college were dissatisfied with their own lives, which dissatisfaction differentiated them from "common man" fathers who gave no college-going encouragement.[1] Kahl's research has been built upon by Cohen who demonstrates a two-dimensional motivation for parental encouragement of college among "common man" boys.[2] Dissatisfied fathers saw college as occupationally advantageous, while downwardly mobile mothers stressed status enhancement as motivation for attending college. Jackson and Marsden's research into the educational accomplishments of British working class children supports this latter point.[3] Their most powerful variable was a condition of downward family mobility, which they labeled a "sunken middle class" status. For these children the rise to middle class status, symbolized by college entrance, represented a return to a position held by the family of origin during the grandparents' generation.

Other possible sociological explanations for differential behavior, among apparently homogeneous status groups, may be revealed by Wilensky, who attempted to sort out the effects of class culture and of occupational cultures on behavior,[1] where occupational cultures are grounded in common tasks, work schedules, job training and career patterns. He hypothesized that the occupant of a career role,which he defined as a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in an ordered, predictable sequence, presenting him with the prospect of continuous, predictable rewards, is willing to train and achieve. Some blue collar positions are more career-like than others, and may thus contribute to behavior not traditionally associated with manual workers. Lockwood has also been interested in the structural components of occupations and their relationships to attitudes.[2] Specifically, he has studied the possible effects on a man's future-time orientation from following an apprenticeship in a skilled trade, in which the necessity to defer economic gratification during the apprenticeship may contribute to a forward-looking mentality, generally thought to be characteristic of the middle class. Like those of Wilensky, Lockwood's ideas are formulated in terms of the relationship between work tasks and eventual monetary and social rewards.

---

[1] Joseph Kahl, "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (1953) pp. 186-203.

[2] Elizabeth G. Cohen, op.cit., pp. 404-425.

[3] Brian Jackson and Dennis Marsden, Education and the Working Class (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962).

Informal and formal associations may also contribute to differences in behavior. The well-known correlates of group membership, such as channelling of behavior and changing of attitudes, which operate through the unequal distribution of group-based rewards, are seemingly powerful. Meaningful social interaction across large status differences is probably minute, since both life styles and belief systems are likely to be quite dissimilar. But interaction may be significant within a large middle mass, which, according to some students, characterizes modern United States society. Curtiss argues, from his reanalysis of the Miller and Swanson[1] data, that differential association is not high in the "middle mass" of occupation groups.[2] "Middle mass" persons, occupy work roles which cut across the traditional white collar-blue collar status line but do not include either the upper or the lower range of occupational positions, and are distinguished neither by great success nor great failure. Persons in middle mass occupations tend not to limit friendships to their own occupational strata. If this phenomenon is generalized, blue collar-white collar friendship patterns may develop, in which blue collar workers will associate with better educated persons, or occupants of more career-like white collar positions. Suburban blue collar workers may simply be presented with opportunities to interact with persons who occupy white collar positions, since the pool of available white collar workers is generally greater in the suburbs than in the central city. Thus, association with persons who have received advantages from education may be acccompanied by adoption, among blue collar workers, of favorable attitudes toward education.

---

[1] Harold Wilensky, "Work, Careers and Social Integration," International Social Science Journal, 12 (1960) pp. 543-60.

[2] David Lockwood, "The New 'Working Class'," European Journal of Sociology, 1, 2, pp. 248-59.

---

[1] Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson, The Changing American Parent (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).

[2] Richard Curtiss, "Differential Association and the Stratification of the Urban Community," Social Forces, 42,1, pp. 68-77.

Bell and Force demonstrate a significantly higher rate of participation in formal non-work organizations among blue collar workers who live in a "high status" neighborhood than among those who live in a "low status" neighborhood.[1] While they cannot explain their findings, they speculate that the phenomenon may be due to economic or demographic characteristics of the two neighborhoods, or perhaps to a generalized neighborhood role expectation, operating on all members of the higher status neighborhood. Although some blue collar workers may participate in non-work organizations, Holden warns that most such associations should not be viewed as reference groups.[2] His argument is that the acceptance of voluntary associations as reference groups suggests that they have a greater effect on their membership than is the case.

The effects of cross-strata interaction on attitudes have been explored by Wilson[3] and by Ramsøy[4] who both found that working class children who attended high schools which enrolled predominantly middle class children were more likely to attend college than were working class children enrolled in predominantly working class high schools. Wilson attributes his findings to the working class childrens' exposure to,and association with, children for whom college-going is a positive value.

---

[1] Wendell Bell and Maryanne Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, 21 (1956) pp. 25-34.

[2] David E.W. Holden, "Associations as Reference Groups: An Approach to the Problem," Rural Sociology, 30 (1965) pp. 63-74.

[3] Alan B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, 24 (1959) pp. 836-45.

[4] Natalie Rogoff Ramsøy, unpublished data.

Although this mode of explanation is plausible, it is very difficult to test. We can ask whether the differences might be due to attitudes already held, which found confirmation within the more middle class setting. The families might have expressed prior desire that their children go to college and have given additional support by moving to a community whose high school provided greater opportunity to enter college. This dilemma of selective migration, versus change of attitudes, is explored with difficulty by social scientists. Finally, it may be due to the fact that, in a predominantly middle class school, working class children are more likely to have middle class friends than in a predominantly working class school enrolling relatively few middle class children.[1]

For many blue collar workers, the move to a suburb may nonetheless by a manifestation of middle class attitudes, although Berger argues that blue collar workers who move to a preponderantly working class suburb exhibit "typical" working class life styles.[2] Moreover, Axelrod's data show no significant differences in personal interaction rates (a variable thought to differentiate middle and working class persons,between suburban and city blue collar workers.[3]

Blue collar workers who have chosen to live in a suburb occupied primarily by "middle mass" persons, may be representative of a group which is socially, but not occupationally, mobile, and who seek out a neighborhood which they anticipate will be more receptive to their beliefs. Rossi's research provides some evidence that vertical social mobility is sometimes a factor in a family's decision to move.[1] It is particularly a factor in a family move when occupational mobility has occurred. Gans discovered a group of West Enders in Boston whom he labeled "extrenally mobile." These persons had moved from the West End, perhaps, he argues, as a result of adoption of a new life style which was incompatible with the West End subculture.[2] On the other hand, Gans argues from different data that the most important reasons for blue collar moves to a suburban community were bound up with their desire for a single-family dwelling.[3] In his research he did not detect status aspirations as affecting decisions to move. Bell also argues that social mobility was not involved in a move to the suburbs.[4] Instead, he posited desires for increased physical space and what he called a "quest for community." Moreover, only ten percent of the reasons recorded for moving explicitly involved the desire for better schools.[5] These findings would argue against a selective migration explanation for differences between suburban and city blue collar workers with respect to their orientations to the middle class.[1]

---

[1] Ernest Q. Campbell and C. Normal Alexander, "Structural Effects and Interpersonal Relationships" American Journal of Sociology, 71 (November 1965) pp. 284-89.

[2] Bennet Berger, Working Class Suburb (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960).

[3] Morris Axelrod, "Urban Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, 21 (1956) p. 16.

---

[1] Peter Rossi, Why Families Move (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

[2] Herbert Gans, op. cit.

[3] Herbert Gans, "Effects of the Move From City to Suburb," The Urban Condition, ed. Leonard J. Duhl (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963).

[4] Wendell Bell, "Familism and Suburbanization: One Test of the Social Choice Hypothesis," Rural Sociology, 21 (1956) pp. 276-83.

[5] While Bell's sample included blue collar workers, he did not treat them separately in the analysis.

The research I have reviewed, then, defines two traditionally dominant patterns among blue collar workers:[2] a strong desire for security and stability; an ambivalence toward education. However, as has been demonstrated, both of these patterns may be subject to change under special conditions. I anticipate dealing in this dissertation with conditions which might lead to variation.

Statement of the Problem

It was previously stated that persons develop attitudes, and exhibit behavior, in response to pressures created by their environments. The mechanism posited was one of access to social rewards and punishments. While there are almost an infinite number of environments in which any individual participates, four have been chosen for closer examination. They are: the environment of the family of orientation, or a man's background; the environment of a man's informal social interactions, or his friendship and acquaintanceship patterns; the environment of the work place, including his specific activities,his rewards, and the persons with whom he shares the work place; and finally, the environment of a man's voluntary membership in non-work organizations. For example, the extensive use of education by the middle and upper middle class families reflects the extent to which these three inter-personal networks reinforce positive attitudes toward educational achievement. The higher status white collar worker receives reinforcement from an educated family, his own employment experiences confirm the wisdom of attaining a high level of education, and his informal and formal social contacts probably are with persons of similar background and experience, thus reinforcing his beliefs.

---

[1] Although direct questions have not produced support for the selective migration hypothesis in the research, there still exists the possibility that the mechanism operates. For example, the preponderance of reasons which can be classified as a simple desire for increased physical space, may in fact reflect a desire to acquire the symbols of the middle class. Without a longitudinal research design in which movement to the suburbs is predicted by some measure of social class value position, the question must be begged.

[2] These patterns generally do not apply to persons who, because of race or sub-cultural backgrounds or other conditions, have no skills, or are unable to hold any one job for very long. These persons, for the most part, have very little control over their own lives and tend to live only on the periphery of organized society.

The middle and upper-middle classes do not use education to achieve vocational ends only. There exists a consumption aspect of education. This aspect includes manners and mores which control how one ought to lead one's life. Intellectual and cultural-leisure activities are thought to be important components of the life pattern, and the ability to participate fully in them is thought to be a consequence of advanced education. Therefore, education is viewed by such persons as a necessary and natural dimension of the maintenance, or enhancement, of their childrens' statuses.

Further, the white collar worker's knowledge of the variability of educational institutions, and of the potential returns from college attendance in prestige, employment opportunities and intellectual development, allows him to discriminate between educational experiences which are valuable and those which are not. For him, educational decisions will be made in terms of means, since the ends are known and valued.

Similarly for the blue collar worker, the relationships among family, work groups and friends may also reinforce attitudes toward education. Among unskilled workers and those who have been called members of the working class sub-culture, devaluation of education appears prevalent. Research indicates that large groups of blue collar workers demand of education only that it teach children immediately marketable skills and good citizenship. There appears to be little demand that education contribute to intellectual and cultural growth, since such growth is not seen as providing immediate economic rewards. Such groups tend not to jeopardize family stability to provide social mobility for their children. Because of their relative lack of exposure to occupational roles which demand college training, such roles will be little understood, and the routes to them will be only vaguely perceived. Their own experience will allow them to visualize the rewards of a high school or trade school education. But, in view of the necessary costs and the uncertain rewards, college-going will be perceived as an unnecessary risk to family security.

However, other blue collar workers appear to place a different value on education. This blue collar group may represent a legitimate addition to the middle class in that it views a college education as having intellectual, as well as economic, rewards.[1] It may also represent the elite of the blue collar occupational group, in that movement from the top of the blue collar work world into a white collar position depends on a college education. Or, it may represent some form of transitional group, in which instrumental considerations are paramount, but not exhaustive. Broadly speaking, the hypothesis of this study is that the educational demands of blue collar workers are the products of interactions among the four already defined environments. Each of the four contributes a distinct set of experiences. The experiences will be rewarding or not, and will consequently strengthen or weaken attitudes and behavior.

---

[1] This is not to argue that all middle class persons subscribe to the intellectual values of college, but that a measure of central tendency would be higher among white collar workers than among blue collar workers.

Specific predictions of the relative effects of the four environments are somewhat premature, but a model has use in guiding this research. The model in essence is: social origins predispose one's attitude formation; friendship patterns and the activity-specific components of occupation affect attitude formation and the direction of behavior; and, the negotiable components of an occupation may support such formation and direction.

The family has a significant role in value formation.[1] Attitudes about education derive in part from those held by the family, and historically, blue collar workers have not valued education. Origins in a blue collar family, then, can be expected to have provided an environment in which personal educational achievement did not receive a significant share of rewards given by the family. Therefore there is little incentive for an individual from such a family to have developed positive attitudes toward education. Further, if the work environment affects attitudes and behavior, social origins may act indirectly. The point of entry into the labor market is frequently a function of social origins, in that intergenerational occupational mobility has been small enough to occasion concern from sociologists interested in the possible rigidity of the American stratification system.[1] Thus, a blue collar family indirectly affects the values of its children by influencing job choice, which may in turn reinforce familial value positions.

---

[1] See for instance a classic statement of The Process of Socialization by Irvin L. Child in Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by Gardner Lindzey (New York: Addison-Wesley, 1954) II, 18, pp. 655-689.

The negotiable components of occupation -- income, prestige and security -- would seem to act as mediating variables. By providing the necessary finances and the possibility of realistic long-range planning, they make possible social and personal experiences which affect attitudes about college-going. They do so by freeing the individual from the constant pressure to simply survive and by giving him the freedom to search out experiences beyond the home and work place if he desires to do so. The resulting new experiences may lead to new demands and to behavior which is meant to realize them.

Informal and formal social interaction may affect attitudes and behavior through such phenomena as those found in the research on reference groups, or through those postulated in balance theory.

In the former approach, the power of groups to channel behavior and to change attitudes is well documented. Salience, or meaningfulness, an important variable in reference group research, may be inferred tentatively from reported frequency of participation. Continued high rates of participation, where coercion is not present, is argued to be indicative of salience.[2] Thus, a man's membership in a voluntary non-work organization may create a set of experiences which induce him to value a college education for his children.

---

[1] See Otis Dudley Duncan, "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review, 30 (1965) pp.491-98 for one of the latest attempts to measure intergenerational mobility.

[2] See George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961) p. 181 ff.

Friendship patterns may structure attitudes and behavior in a similar fashion. Balance theory[1] posits that in the interaction between two persons around an object or event a state of cognitive balance is constantly sought. Thus, if one member of a dyad values an object, the other member will also tend to value that object, if he also values or likes the other dyad member. Therefore, I expect that the attitudes of one member of a friendship pair will be similar to those of the other member. Consequently, continued interaction between blue and white collar workers will probably be accompanied by relative similarity with respect to attitudes toward college. This phenomenon may occur as a result of two processes: either the blue collar worker changes his attitude in light of his perception of the rewards experienced by the better educated white collar worker, or, the white collar worker serves as a reinforcing agent of already-held attitudes.[2]

Further, the blue collar worker may see in his white collar friend or neighbor an alternative occupational model for his children. If he desires that his children assume such a role, or if his children desire it for themselves, the white collar worker may also serve as a source of information to help him understand the requirements of, and routes to, white collar status. To the extent that white collar occupational roles require more education than high school graduation, a white collar worker is a potential source of knowledge to a blue collar worker concerning the type of activity required to secure such an education.

---

[1] Dorwin Cartwright and Frank Harary, "Structural Balance: A Generalization of Heider's Theory," in D. Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.), Group Dynamics (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1962) pp. 705-727.

[2] A third possibility exists in which the white collar worker changes his attitudes to correspond to those of the blue collar worker. This is most likely to occur when the white collar worker cannot justify to himself the value of his own advanced education, either in terms of economic or intellectual rewards. I have no mention of assessing the degree to which this phenomenon operates, but believe it is not widespread.

The role of activity-specific components of an occupation is not yet clear. I have chosen to directly examine interaction patterns and the nature of the tasks performed as possible influences on attitudes and behavior. Indirectly, the effect of technical innovation will also be explored, but only as it relates to perceived job security. New life circumstances may be created by activity-specific components of an occupation, and the new environments may in turn provide new rewards or create new pressures, either of which may affect previously held attitudes and subsequent behavior.

The effects of the four environments on the dependent variables will probably be interaction effects, but an initial analytic separation is useful. It will enable a more detailed examination of their relationships to each other and to the dependent variables.

Two introductory comments are necessary before stating the hypotheses. The first is that they will be stated in broad terms to simplify their format. Each hypothesis reflects one of the four environments in its entirety, and does not distinguish between attitudes and supportive behavior. Following the general statement of the hypothesis within each environment, a tabular representation of the separate elements of the environment and their relationships to both attitudes and supportive behavior will be made. This representation will hopefully clarify the components of each environment cluster.

The second is that "support for college-going" as used in the hypotheses includes both positive attitudes toward a college education for children, and behavior which may be interpreted as supportive of those attitudes. The former variable includes four attitude subsets which seem to me to encompass the evenuual kinds of support in the educative process which a parent may make. They are: a willingness to provide financial support; desiring to provide intellectual or academic guidance; desiring to provide overt support for childrens' ambitions; and valuing the results of the educational process. Each of these four elements characterizes a time-oriented phase of total support for college-going, but precedes the actual decision to go. The latter variable, supportive behavior, is included on that assumption that if a father believes it important for his child to attend college he will assist in the process of picking a college, applying for admission, and ultimately, meeting the costs. This assumption rests on one further assumption; that the blue collar worker is able to take an active part because he has enough knowledge to make his participation useful.

A. Social Background

A major environment from which attitudes may be learned is the family of orientation. Middle class social origins have been shown to be related to valuing of education among blue collar workers. However, in the United States, high educational attainment by children of blue collar workers is too frequent to be explained by the idea of a sunken middle class. Indirectly, social origins can influence attitudes and behavior by having affected the educational level of the respondent. His own education is predicted to be related to his subsequent attitudes and supportive behavior. Thus it is hypothesized that:

Among blue collar workers, educational level will be

> independently related to positive support for college-going by one's children. (Hypothesis 1.)
>
> Among blue collar workers, family social origins which reflect higher occupational levels will be independently related to positive support for college attendance by one's children. (Hypothesis 2.)

FIGURE 1

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL BACKGROUND AND SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE GOING

A. Education of Respondent → Positive Attitudes[1]

B. Education of Respondent → Supportive Behavior

C. Education of Respondent's Wife → Positive Attitudes

D. Education of Respondent's Wife → Supportive Behavior

E. Occupation of Respondent's Father → Positive Attitudes

F. Occupation of Respondent's Father → Supportive Behavior

B. The Informal Social Environment

In so far as attitudes and behavior are reinforced or changed through group membership, I expect that the social environment of the blue collar worker will have an effect on his desires for education for his children. Typically, social interactions of blue collar workers have been directed toward other blue collar workers. However, suburban blue collar workers may find themselves in a social environment in which they are accepted as equals by white collar workers, due to the large number of white collar workers who reside in suburbs, and are neighbors of blue collar workers. Although friends tend to be chosen from among persons perceived as social equals, neighbors constitute a not unreasonable pool from which to choose. Neighborhood friendships may develop in which blue collar workers interact with white collar workers. The interaction may be prompted by the shared problems of establishing a household in a new context. The white collar workers are presumed to value education. The blue collar worker may adopt the norms of the friendship dyad and may behave according to its expectations.[1] Consequently, the hypothesis is:

---

[1] The symbol "→" will be used to signify a sufficient and independent relationship between the Independent Variable and the Dependent Variables.

> Among blue collar workers higher rates and intensity of informal association with white collar workers will be independently related to positive support for college attendance by one's children. (Hypothesis 3.)

FIGURE 2

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE INFORMAL SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT AND SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE-GOING

G. Interaction with White Collar Neighbor ⟶ Positive Attitudes

H. Interaction with White Collar Neighbor ⟶ Supportive Behavior

I. Possession of White Collar Friend ⟶ Positive Attitudes

J. Possession of White Collar Friend ⟶ Supportive Behavior

C. The Work Environment

Since this study is primarily concerned with differences among blue collar workers, the census classification "blue collar worker" normally found in the literature is not quite precise enough, except to define the population. A more analytic differentation is needed in describing blue collar jobs. I have chosen two clusters of an occupation. Its components refer to those activities and experiences which are confined to the work place. One obvious variate is the amount of interaction with persons who perform white collar tasks.

---

[1] I realize that a potential for prior socialization to middle class attitudes exists. I will explore this phenomenon with questions designed to elicit responses indicative of anticipatory socialization, but state no hypotheses.

In so far as a white collar position tends to be more intellectual in job content and tends to require more formal education for entry, a blue collar position which offers its occupant increased opportunities for interaction with white collar workers may expose the blue collar worker to concrete alternative occupational behavior.

If a blue collar worker desires mobility for his children, a job which allows him to observe the requirements of, and the routes to, white collar status may be conducive to the adoption of positive educational attitudes. Further, like having white collar friends and neighbors, having white collar work-mates represents a potential source of information about the kind of behavior generally expected of parents in implementing a decision about college entrance. I test position placement in blue collar-white collar work-place interaction networks as follows:

> Blue collar workers in positions of greater on-the-job contact with white collar workers will express more positive support for college-going for their children than will blue collar workers in positions of less on-the-job contact with white collar workers. This relationship will be independent of the negotiable and other activity-specific components of the occupation. (Hypothesis 4.)

FIGURE 3

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ON THE JOB INTERACTION PATTERNS AND SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE-GOING

K. Interaction with White Collar Work Mates ⟶ Positive Attitudes

L. Interaction with White Collar Work Mates ⟶ Supportive Behavior

The activity-specific cluster also includes the extent to which the job demands manipulation of ideas and symbols, the degree of autonomy granted to the worker, and the degree of responsibility demanded. I have assumed that there are differences among blue collar roles with respect to these variables. For example, an industrial foremanship would seem to demand significantly different skills than an assembly line position. These demands, and the responses to them, may affect one's orientation to education. Specifically, the hypothesis is:[1]

> Persons in blue collar positions which have higher job content will express more positive support for college-going for their children than will persons in blue collar positions which have lower job content. (Hypothesis 5.)

FIGURE 4

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN JOB CONTENT AND
SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE GOING

M. Higher Job Content → Positive Attitudes

N. Higher Job Content → Supportive Behavior

The second cluster of job components is what I have called the "negotiable" aspect of an occupation. This cluster includes the status-linked correlates of level of income and job prestige, plus security of position. The term "negotiable" is used because these elements may be "spent" in the social arena to maintain or enhance one's position. They are the visible aspects of an occupation in the urban setting and are those by which one's occupation-linked position in the stratification system is evaluated by others. Traditionally, blue collar occupations carry lower prestige, provide less income and are relatively less secure, compared to white collar occupations. But variability among blue collar positions may be important in explaining variation in educational support. A higher income may be used to "purchase" the accoutrements of a middle class life style. Higher job prestige may be used to "purchase" acceptance as a social equal by white collar, middle class persons. Security of position may be used to "purchase" a reality in which long-term planning is possible. The negotiable aspects of an occupation probably do not contribute independently to expressions of positive educational desires. Instead their role would seem to be one of granting to an individual a certain degree of freedom of actual and desired social movement. If the occupant of a stable blue collar work-role from which he derives a fairly high income desires to adopt the consumption style of the middle class, he may not be restrained from doing so by the realities of his economic position. Likewise, the prestige of a blue collar role may also constrain the occupant of a lower prestige position from establishing social interactions which include occupants of higher prestige positions. If this were the case we might expect a threshold effect, below which point it would be virtually impossible for a man to plan for college, but above which he could, if induced to do so by other factors. Recognizing that some aspects of the relationships may be spurious, it is hypothesized that:

---

[1] As used in Hypothesis 5, the term "Job Content" will refer to an index variable composed of the extent of symbol manipulation, job autonomy, and responsibility. Roughly speaking, the higher that Job Content is the more similar the position is to a white collar position.

> Blue collar workers with higher income, greater perceived job security and greater job prestige will express more positive support for college-going for their children than will blue collar workers with lower incomes, less perceived job security and less job prestige, controlling for interaction patterns and the other activity-specific components of the occupation. (Hypothesis 6.)

FIGURE 5

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NEGOTIABLE COMPONENTS OF AN OCCUPATION AND SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE GOING

O. Higher Income → Positive Attitudes
P. Higher Income → Supportive Behavior
Q. Higher Job Security → Positive Attitudes
R. Higher Job Security → Supportive Behavior
S. Higher Job Prestige → Positive Attitudes
T. Higher Job Prestige → Supportive Behavior

D. The Environment of Voluntary Non-Work Organizations

Voluntary participation in formal non-work organizations is in reality a second network of interpersonal relations, but of a somewhat different kind than friendship and neighborhood interactions. Increased participation in community organizations may be a symbol of the adoption of traditional middle class norms. It may be a manifestation of values which I have argued accrue from informal interaction with middle class persons. In order to explore further this relationship it is hypothesized that:

> Increased participation in formal voluntary non-work organizations will be positively related to rates and intensity of informal association with white collar workers. (Hypothesis 7.)
>
> Controlling for rates and intensity of informal association with white collar workers, voluntary participation in formal organizations will not be related to positive support for college-going for one's children. (Corollary.)

FIGURE 6

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTICIPATION IN VOLUNTARY NON-WORK ORGANIZATIONS AND SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE-GOING

U. Interaction with White Collar Friend and Neighbor → Participation in Voluntary Non-Work Organizations

V. Participation in Non-Work Organizations → Positive Attitudes

W. Participation in Non-Work Organizations → Supportive Behavior

The rationale for this corollary is that voluntary participation in non-work organizations reflects an attitude set deriving from a specific set of values, from which also derive positive educational attitudes. That is, the desire to be middle class may result in increased participation in certain types of voluntary non-work organizations in order to manifest in one's own life the perceived behavior of the aspired-to social position. Likewise, the desire to send one's child to college may result from the same underlying value. Since I have argued that this value set can be altered through having white collar friends or through interaction with a white collar neighbor, any relationship between increased participation in non-work organization and support for college-going will be spurious.

Separating the four variable clusters allows a somewhat more detailed analysis of the relations of each to the dependent variables. However, the combined effects of the independent variables represent more interesting questions. Potentially, the suburban blue collar worker is subject to conflicting group pressures. He may not be accepted by his white collar neighbors, even though his job may allow him to emulate their life styles, and may expose him to white collar superordinates. He may be accepted as a social equal by white collar persons, although his job requires no intellectual skills and isolates him from white collar work roles. Without specifically predicting the outcomes of such cross pressures, I expect that social origins and participation in formal non-work organizations will have the least effect. Friendship patterns and the activity-specific occupation components are expected to be the most significant predictors of educational attitudes. The negotiable components of an occupation are expected to act as mediating variables.

The relative effects of these variables on supportive behavior are more difficult to predict. It is assumed that behavior is more subject than are attitudes to influence from social interactions. Consequently, friendship patterns and neighborhood interactions may prove to have more of an effect on behavior than on attitudes. Further, once the decision to go to college is made within the family group, there may be a regularized pattern of behavior which ultimately leads to the realization of the decision. This path may be unknown to the blue collar worker, prompting him to turn to extra-familial sources to learn the expected behavior.

CHAPTER II

THE PLAN OF THE STUDY

Several studies have dealt with blue collar workers. Only those of King, Cohen and Berger have been directly concerned with suburban blue collar workers as a sub-group of the general blue collar social stratum.[1] However Berger chose a suburb which was almost 100% blue collar in composition. King compared life styles of suburban blue collar and white collar workers, but did not attempt to relate these to interaction patterns or to differences other than location of the suburbs in the urban periphery and to the ratios of white collar to blue collar workers.

The Setting

Two main criteria were used for selecting the population of this study. The first was that blue collar-white collar interactions within this neighborhood not be precluded by residential segregation based on occupational role. The second was that variation in blue collar occupations be as great as possible accepting the fact that very low income blue collar workers could probably not afford to live in the suburbs.

In order to satisfy the first criterion, that interaction with white collar workers be possible, a residential suburban area was selected in which blue collar and white collar workers resided side by side. The suburban area, Bremen Township in Cook County, is composed primarily of seven separate municipalities. These seven suburban towns range in population from 3,500 to 12,000; all have at least doubled since 1950. Almost eighty percent of the population of the township is found within municipal boundaries. The other twenty percent are about evenly divided between collections of privately built homes and tract developments outside municipal boundaries. There remain within the township substantial amounts of open land, ideal for subdivision, and before 1970 4,900 additional homes will probably be built. The housing pattern to date has been one of a preponderance of medium cost, single family units, with from three to five bedrooms. Table 1 presents data relevant to the composition of the communities.

---

[1] Gary W. King, "Selected Patterns of Behavior and Social Characteristics of White Collar and Blue Collar Residents in Three Suburban Subdivisions" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965) Elizabeth Cohen, op. cit.; Bennett Berger, op. cit.

TABLE 1

HOUSING AND GROWTH PATTERNS OF BREMEN TOWNSHIP

	COMMUNITY						
	Posen	Midlothian	Markham	Oak Forest	Tinley Park	Hazel Crest	Country Club Hills[b]
1960 POPULATIONS	4.5[a]	6.6	11.7	3.7	6.4	6.2	3.4
%GROWTH 1950-60	151.6	105.4	325.1	100.6	174.8	191.5	
%OF OCCUPIED UNITS OWNER-OCCUPIED 1960	81.6	89.9	91.3	83.7	89.0	91.3	98.5
MEDIAN VALUE OF HOMES	15.1[c]	14.2	16.2	14.6	16.1	16.7	16.8

[a] In thousands.

[b] Country Club Hills did not exist in 1950.

[c] In thousands of dollars.

Source: Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, Suburban Fact Book, March, 1964.

These communities are typical of much of modern suburbia, in that they are new and relatively homogeneous with respect to the type of housing they provide. Fifty-eight and two tenths percent of the occupants moved into the communities between 1955 and 1960.

The occupational distribution of the communities departs from the stereotypical middle class, white collar suburb described by Whyte[1] and from the blue collar enclave described by Berger.[2] The communities have about equal distributions of white collar and blue collar occupations. The communities tend to have about equal income patterns. The data are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

INCOME AND OCCUPATION OF BREMEN TOWNSHIP

	COMMUNITY						
	Posen	Midlothian	Markham	Oak Forest	Tinley Park	Hazel Crest	Country Club Hills
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME, 1960	$6,800	$7,600	$7,500	$7,700	$7,800	$8,600	$8,300
PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES OVER $10,000, 1959	19.1	19.8	22.0	26.2	22.1	32.9	26.9
PERCENT OF EMPLOYED MALES IN ALL BLUE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS, 1960	75.5	53.2	62.4	59.8	57.1	43.3	39.9

Source: Suburban Fact Book, ibid.

---

[1] William H. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956).

[2] Bennett Berger, op.cit.

From Tables 1 and 2 it can be seen that the first criterion is satisfied; blue collar and white collar social interactions are not precluded by gross differences in social class, in so far as level of income and residence value indicate social class.

The second criterion, that variation in blue collar occupations be great, is somewhat reduced by satisfying the first criterion. Minimum degrees of occupational stability and level of income must be present to enable the occupant of a blue collar position to purchase a home. As a result, the census category of "unskilled laborer" is under-represented in the area. The distribution of blue collar occupations, within census tracts, is presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS AMONG BLUE COLLAR CATEGORIES

CENSUS TRACT

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
CENSUS CATEGORY	N=1628	N=634	N=819	N=781	N=1012	N=1080	N=610
CRAFTSMEN, FOREMEN AND KINDRED	52.1%	45.1%	37.4%	43.9%	54.8%	50.0%	59.3%
OPERATIVES AND KINDRED	33.5	38.8	44.1	36.1	35.9	33.8	28.1
PRIVATE HOUSE-HOLD WORKERS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.6
SERVICE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD	5.8	8.6	4.5	7.8	4.7	7.9	3.2
LABORERS, EXCEPT MINE	8.5	7.4	14.1	12.1	4.1	6.2	8.5
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Source: United States Census of Population: 1960 Census Tract Reports (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1960).

The township, then, tends to be about evenly split between blue collar and white collar workers, who live in about the same kinds of houses and who have about equal incomes. There is variation in occupations among blue collar workers, although it is presumed that most of them have stable enough jobs and high enough incomes to purchase medium cost single family homes. Among the blue collar workers, skilled and semi-skilled positions predominate.[1]

Thus, it is possible for a blue collar worker both to interact socially with a white collar neighbor and to have some interaction with white collar workers on the job, since skilled and semi-skilled positions are often supervised by occupants of white collar positions and may, in some cases, be classified at the same level of an organization hierarchy. In addition, the level of income of these blue collar citizens is high enough to allow them to purchase many of the artifacts of a suburban, middle class, life.

One further series of facts is relevant for our understanding of the community. It is not one of the suburban areas which has historically demanded the highest quality educational services. It is, rather, a community which demands schools, and taxes itself for them, but does not bring pressure to bear if only 60% of the student body is enrolled in college-preparatory courses. A recent study of the township's high schools stated, "The task of those responsible for education in Bremen Township is to develop the best possible education for all types of students, not only those few (underlining mine) whose intersts are in academic pursuits.[1]

---

[1] There is a possible upward bias in my results with respect to both attitudes and supportive behavior, resulting from the selection of the population. However, this bias is unavoidable and works equally in similar populations. The most serious disadvantage of having chosen such a population is that inferences to the whole range of blue collar occupations are precluded.

The Sample

From the population of suburban blue collar workers a sample was identified according to five criteria. The first was that the blue collar male have children in high school. Since my interest is in support for college-going of one's children, the restriction to those for whom such a possibility exists in the near future is logical. The second criterion was that the parents be Caucasian. This restriction was thought necessary in order to rule out race-related differences in interaction patterns, income level and occupational position within the blue collar spectrum. As a result of this criterion, Hazel Crest is under-represented, since the school district boundary encompasses a predominantly Negro section of that town.

The third criterion was that the child of the blue collar worker have attended only public schools. This restriction was thought necessary to rule out possible effects on the child's aspirations from parochial school education, which might in turn be reflected in parental support for college. As a result of this criterion, Posen is under-represented. The loss was thought not to be serious, since this community most resembled the one described by Berger, in that blue collar workers comprise 75.5 pecent of the work force. In addition, it is the oldest community and has the lowest percentage of owner-occupied housing.

---

[1] J. Alan Thomas, "Report to the Board of Education, Bremen Township High School District," Midwest Administration Center, July, 1964, p. 3.

The fourth criterion was that the child of the blue collar worker be in the upper one-half of his class academically. Such a restriction was thought necessary to preclude the possibility that negative parental support for a college education resulted from a realistic assessment of the child's opportunity to attend college. A child in the lower one-half of his class in these high schools was judged to have little possibility of attending college, because of the relatively lower college orientation of the curriculum and the teaching staff. This restriction led to the fifth criterion, namely that the child be in grades ten, eleven or twelve. This criterion was necessary because the sample was drawn in the summer and only those students who had been in high school for at least one year had established a record amenable to meaningful academic ranking. While this restriction reduced the possible sample size, it did increase the probability that the parents would have begun to form some attitudes about the post-high school plans of their children.

In terms of these criteria, a 100 percent sample was drawn from the student records of the school district. All fathers of students who satisfied the above criteria were included in the sample. Thus, the sample was composed of Caucasian male blue collar workers with children in the upper one-half of their respective high school classes. The blue collar occupations which were represented will be shown to reflect the blue collar occupational distribution of the community as a whole.

Each possible respondent was sent a personal letter by the National Opinion Research Center informing him of the general nature of the study and requesting his support.[1] The first contact was made in person by the interviewers and an interview was obtained or a business card was left. Follow-up, when necessary, was by phone and by personal contact. Three hundred forty-two of the original 426, comprising 80.3 percent of the sample, were interviewed. Nine interviews were not completed or were returned with unusable information. The final subject group contained 333 respondents, or 78.2 percent of the original sample.

The 84 members of the original sample who were not interviewed were unavailable for several reasons. These reasons, as given by the interviewers to the staff of the National Opinion Research Center, are tabulated below.

TABLE 4

REASONS GIVEN FOR NON-INTERVIEWS

	NUMBER
UNAVAILABLE WITHIN PERIOD ALLOTTED FOR COMPLETION OF INTERVIEWS	36
REFUSED TO BE INTERVIEWED	28
MOVED OUT OF TOWNSHIP	16
DIED	4
TOTAL	84

All of those who refused initially were contacted first by letter and then in person. If, after this follow-up, they continued to refuse, nothing more was done to induce their cooperation.

---

[1] Financial support for the study was obtained from the U.S. Office of Education. Funds were made available to sub-contract with the National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois. Their role was one of hiring and training interviewers, printing the interview schedule, pretesting the schedule and directing the field work. The author was responsible for construction of the schedule, coding, punching and analyzing the data.

An attempt was made to assess the effect of the loss of these persons from the sample. Since the major criterion for original selection was occupational role, a comparative analysis of the occupations of the non-respondents and the respondents was made.

The occupation of each subject was known beforehand from the school records. The mean job prestige score of the non-respondents was computed and compared to the same score for the respondents, using Duncan's[1] job prestige scale. These two scores were 61.55 and 62.78 respectively. While this difference was not tested for significance, due to the impossibility of determining variance, it was judged that the sample was not biased by refusals from occupants of either high or low prestige occupations. The distributions were similar and are presented in Table 5.

---

[1] Otis Dudley Duncan, "Appendix B," in Albert J. Riess, Jr., Occupations and Social Status (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961).

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESTIGE SCORES FOR RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS (In 5 Point Intervals)

PRESTIGE SCORE RANGE	NON-RESPONDENTS (N=85)	RESPONDENTS (N=333)
35-39	0.0%	0.9%
40-44	0.0	1.2
45-49	10.5	3.6
50-54	14.1	14.1
55-59	5.8	14.4
60-64	22.3	13.2
65-69	30.5	28.8
70-74	11.7	28.8
75-79	2.3	0.9
	100.0%	100.0%

Further, in so far as Duncan's score reflects income and education levels, no biases from these factors are apparent.

Even though the sample was constrained by five criteria, a second comparison of occupational prestige scores was made. By using mean prestige scores of census categories five, six, seven and eight, weighted by the number of total employed males within each, residing in the township, a mean job prestige score was derived for all employed males in Bremen Township. This mean prestige score is 59.58 and differs only slightly from the mean score of the sample group, which was 62.78.[1] Again the same interpretations about income and educational levels led to the judgment that the sample accurately reflected the blue collar population of the township.

TABLE 6

MEAN JOB PRESTIGE SCORE FOR SELECTED BLUE COLLAR GROUPS IN BREMEN TOWNSHIP

GROUP	SCORE
STUDY SAMPLE (N=333)	62.78
NON-RESPONDENTS (N=84)	61.55
ALL BLUE COLLAR WORKERS (N=6537)	59.58

A rough comparison of income levels of the sample and the township as a whole provides evidence which tends to contradict the above judgment. The median family income, before taxes, of the sample is $9,600 per year. This is higher than for any single community (Table 2), based on 1959 census information. A crude estimate of median family income for the township in 1959 is $7,700. While the difference is significant, applying an inflation rate of 2% per year increases that median to about $8,700. My sample therefore probably continued to have a higher median family income than the township as a whole. In addition, 43.5% of the survey sample reported family incomes of $10,000 a year or more. Again, this figure is substantially higher than for any single community within the township. However, inflation rates applied to the 1959 income figure will account for some of the difference. Nevertheless, the sample would seem not to be representative of this suburban area with respect to income level.

---

[1] The distribution of occupational prestige scores across the entire township is not greatly different from that of the sample group. 85% of all workers fall in the "Craftsmen and Kindred Workers" or the "Operatives and Kindred Workers" categories. If we assume that a prestige score of 50 or more can be assigned to such workers and that any such worker will have a prestige score of 50 or more, then 85% of the total blue collar work force in the township has a prestige score of 50 or more, compared to 94% of the sample group. While this difference is not large it may have created an upward bias in the results.

An explanation of the difference in income is not hard to obtain. Because these are fathers of high school age children they would be expected to be among the older income earners in the area. In point of fact, the mean age of the sample is 45.09 years. At this age, a blue collar worker has probably accumulated enough experience and seniority to have reached, or be very close to, his peak earning capacity. It appears, then, that any bias from income would operate in the same direction for all fathers of high school children.

The sample of 333 Caucasian, blue collar workers with children in the upper one-half of their suburban high school classes would seem representative of a large number of relatively stable, perhaps somewhat occupationally upwardly mobile, wage earners, not unlike suburban blue collar workers as a whole, in so far as Bremen Township is a typical middle mass suburb.

Instruments

The basic data collection device was by interviews, using a standard interview schedule. Interviews lasted from twenty-five to sixty minutes. The interview schedule, shown in Appendix A, was devised by the author and pre-tested by NORC in Bremen Township during July and August of 1965. A sample of blue collar workers whose children has just graduated from the high schools was drawn for the pre-test. The same criteria were applied to the pre-test sample as were later applied in drawing the study sample. In addition, the population was divided according to whether or not the child had had his transcript of grades sent to a college for consideration as an applicant. Random samples of fifteen were drawn from each of these two groups. On the basis of the eleven interviews from the pre-test sample of thirty, changes in the interview schedule were made. These changes consisted of rewording items and deletion of items which did not discriminate among respondents. The final schedule was then subjected to criticism by staff members of NORC. Some additional changes in wording and question order were made before the final schedule was printed and distributed to the interviewers.

The schedule was composed of 100 questions, sixty of which dealt with the independent variables. Ten questions were used in which the respondent was asked to assess the liklihood that his child would attend college, and to describe activities in which he had engaged that could be described as supportive of the child's attending college. In addition, he was asked to react to a twenty-three item attitude schedule in which his attitudes toward the nature of, his role in, and the outcomes of a college education for his child were elicited.

Of the seventy-two questions in the main schedule, all were highly focussed, and only eleven required interviewer probes of any kind. However, questions were so ordered that a maximum of seven probes were required in any one interview.[1] As many questions as possible were pre-coded after analysis of the pre-test data. As a result of extensive pre-coding and the limited necessity to have the interviewers probe for responses, comparability of stimulus from respondent to respondent was enhanced.

In almost all cases interviews were conducted in the home of the respondent and special efforts were made to exclude other members of the family from observing the interview. All questions, except the attitude schedule and the income level question, were presented and answered orally. The respondent was asked to personally fill out these questions. No time limit was imposed on the respondent for any part of the interview.

THE VARIABLES

Dependent Variables

A. Parental Behavior

Because this study is concerned with the relationships between certain occupational or social class characteristics and a blue collar worker's desires that his child attend college, some measure of behavior was needed which might logically be inferred as supportive for such desires. Parental participation in a child's decision to attend college may be of three types: supportive, coercive, or apathetic. Further, coercive behavior may be either negative or positive in nature. Although a very limited number of coercive-type responses were elicited by the questions, these responses were too few in number to be treated statistically. They took both forms, and typically were expressed in terms either of "My child will go to college if I have anything to do with it" or "It's time for my child to begin to contribute to the support of this family."

---

[1] Responses to open-ended questions were coded by the author. A check on the reliability of the coder was provided by having a second person code a random sample of 35 schedules. In only four instances was disagreement discovered.

Supportive behavior was thought to include such acts as talking with family, friends, high school guidance persons and representatives of colleges, reading college materials such as catalogues, investigating scholarship possibilities, saving money and helping with the actual application form. Each respondent was asked, "Have you made any plans yet to send (him/her) to college?" If he replied that he had, he was asked how many of nine possible actions he had taken. These were pre-coded possibilities and ranged from "talking about it in the family" to visiting colleges. The final "Admissions Index" score is a modified simple summing of those actions taken. It was modified to differentiate those who had talked only with family, neighbors and friends, from those who had taken other action. The rationale for this procedure was that simply discussing the possibilities with other laymen is qualitatively different from discussing it with educators, reading institutional literature, or visiting a college campus.

Such differentiation may work to depress a score on supportive behavior among parents of younger students. Of the total sample, 105, or almost one-third had taken additional actions, while 51 of the 95 parents of 12th grade children had done so.

However, separate analysis of the parents of 12th grade students, using the same index dichotomized at the same point, did not create significantly different interpretations of the data. The Admissions

Index was therefore dichotomized in terms of "having taken action in addition to discussion with family or friends" and "not having taken such additional action or having taken no action," or in terms of a "score," at a level of "3".[1]

A second element of parental support was thought to include the acquisition of information about such standard admissions requirements as selection tests and scholarship applications. Accordingly, three typical procedural elements were chosen and the respondents were asked to identify them. They were: the Illinois State Scholarship Program which provides scholarship funds to Illinois residents who enroll in Illinois institutions; the College Scholarship Service which processes scholarship applications for over 400 colleges and universities in the United States; and, the Scholastic Aptitude Tests which are used by over 500 colleges and universities as selection devices. It was reasoned that such terms would be known by parents of children who were making serious plans to attend college. However, too few identifications were made to allow statistical treatment. As a result, the behavioral variable will be restricted to the Admissions Index.

B. Parental Attitudes

A second dependent variable used in this study is a measure of parental attitudes toward college-going for their children. It was reasoned on an a priori basis that the value placed on college for one's children might be analyzed into four elements; willingness to provide financial support, desiring to give verbal support to children's ambitions, desiring to provide intellectual or academic guidance, and valuing the result of the educational process. An original pool of thirty-eight items was constructed to elicit attitudes about each of these elements. As a result of the pre-test the original pool was decreased to twenty-three. A tentative Guttman Scale was devised with four questions and a Coefficient of Reproductibility of 90.99. However, two imperfect scale scores contained more than 4 percent of the respondents and Question A had more than 10 percent error. The quasi-scale is reproduced below, with questions in descending order of frequency of positive responses.

---

[1] An attempt was made to devise a Guttman scale for the responses to the admissions process items. This attempt was not successful.

A. A parent should be willing to borrow money to pay his child's college expenses.

B. A child would be better off taking a college preparatory program than a vocational program in high school.

C. A child cannot be just as happy without a college education as with one.

D. If a man has a trade he still needs to go to college to be happy.

Because the two criteria of random distribution of errors across respondents and a ten percent ceiling on question error, the scale was judged unfit for use in the study.

Another type of analysis was thought necessary, to avoid having to simply sum the scores over all attitude questions, thereby assuming uni-dimensionality. The response patterns over all twenty-three attitude items were subjected to factor analysis.[1] Standard factor analytic methods were used, based on a correlation matrix of the responses to the attitude items.

---

[1] The procedure followed was developed by Philip K. Olson, Jr., Oxford, Ohio and is reported as Program 6.0.145, IBM 1620 General Program Library.

The data processing formulae are based on Thurston's centroid method.[1] Table 7 shows the unrotated factor loadings for each attitude item on each of four factors. The decision to call for four factors was based on the previous rationale concerning the nature of parental desires about a college education.

TABLE 7

UNROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR 23 ATTITUDE ITEMS
(N=333)

ITEM	H^2	FACTOR			
		I	II	III	IV
1	.144	.190	.250	.098	.190
2	.079	.187	.079	.120	.153
3	.200	.369	-.245	.053	.035
4	.282	.261	-.378	.211	-.164
5	.197	.181	.338	-.176	-.137
6	.229	.327	.139	.256	-.193
7	.216	-.058	-.362	.163	.234
8	.253	.317	-.323	.085	-.202
9	.431	.486	.236	-.363	-.083
10	.266	.406	.149	.185	.210
11	.252	.048	-.494	-.064	-.034
12	.251	.325	-.345	.144	.076
13	.330	.437	.057	-.364	-.055
14	.317	.316	.166	.362	-.241
15	.263	.376	-.212	-.162	.224
16	.365	.430	.071	.237	.344
17	.168	.202	.323	.138	.059
18	.171	.307	-.223	-.32	.097
19	.168	.242	-.183	.058	-.269
20	.127	.275	.222	-.022	-.031
21	.323	.483	-.287	-.055	-.062
22	.217	.326	-.164	-.152	.246
23	.375	.322	.416	-.309	.047
EIGENVALUE		2.40	1.69	0.93	0.74
% VARIANCE		.42	.29	.16	.13 = 1.00

---

[1] See B. J. Fruchter, Introduction to Factor Analysis (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1954) pp. 71-77.

Following Halpin and Croft[1] it was decided to rotate the first three factors even though Factor III has an eigenvalue of 0.93 rather than 1.00 or above. The computer program to rotate factors was based on rotation by Kaiser's varimax method.[2]

TABLE 8

THREE-FACTOR VARIMAX ROTATIONAL SOLUTION FOR
TOTAL SAMPLE
(N=333)

		FACTOR		
ITEM	H^2	I	II	III
1	.108	-.055	.286	-.152
2	.055	.059	.224	-.039
3	.198	.423	.139	.015
4	.255	.420	.129	.248
5	.177	-.087	.129	-.391
6	.191	.097	.425	-.037
7	.160	.192	-.078	.342
8	.212	.437	.098	.104
9	.423	.221	.129	-.598
10	.221	.154	.425	-.126
11	.250	.309	-.233	.210
12	.245	.450	.134	.155
13	.326	.313	.022	-.477
14	.258	.056	.504	.027
15	.212	.433	.009	-.157
16	.246	.219	.441	-.056
17	.164	-.103	.352	-.169
18	.161	.388	-.014	-.100
19	.095	.290	.098	.039
20	.125	.039	.239	-.258
21	.318	.546	.111	-.086
22	.156	.363	.008	-.156
23	.372	-.026	.152	-.590
FACTOR VALUE		2.08	1.34	1.61
%VARIANCE		.36	.23	.28 = .87

---

[1] Andrew F. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963) pp. 37-51.

[2] H. F. Kaiser, "A Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1959, pp. 19, 413-420 as cited in Olson, op.cit.

On the basis of this solution to the factor analysis those items with absolute factor loadings of .300 and above were included in the final representation of the factor. The number of items included in each factor were: Factor I, 10; Factor II, 5; Factor III, 5. Three items were not used in representing the factors. Subsequent analysis indicated that Factors II and III included too few items to discriminate meaningfully among respondents. Factor I and the loadings on each item are presented as Table 9.

TABLE 9

FACTOR I, ITEMS AND ITEM LOADINGS
(N=333)

Loadings	
.546	Going to college is not a waste of time and money for children like mine.
.450	Going to college is not too expensive for people like us to be able to afford.
.437	College educated persons do not tend to snub their parents.
.433	A child would not be better off taking a vocational program than a college preparatory program in high school.
.423	Going to college is not just a status symbol.
.420	Choosing a college is not too complicated for parents to be of much help to their children.
.389	Not the most important thing a high school does is teach students to be good citizens and to obey the laws.
.388	Going to college does not often put funny ideas into children's heads.
.363	If a child wants to keep on going to school after high school it is not up to him to pay most of the expenses.
.313	If a man has a trade he still needs to go to college to be happy.

For each item the four possible responses were: Agree Strongly; Argee Somewhat; Disagree Somewhat; and Disagree Strongly. As presented in Table 9, where items have been reflected as necessary, "Agree Strongly" and "Agree Somewhat" are judged to be positive responses signifying a desire that a child attend college. Each person was scored by assigning a "1" if he answered in a positive manner and a "0" if his answer was negative in nature for each of the ten items.[1] The possible range of scores for each respondent on Factor I is 0-10. Unlike Factors II and III this factor did discriminate among respondents.

The distribution of individual scores over the ten items is presented in Table 10. The factor will be referred to in the rest of the paper as "Attitudes Toward College-Going."

---

[1] The individual factor items were not weighted in computing the final score for each respondent. Because these were attitude items and subject to all the errors inherent in testing attitudes, and because the analysis performed was not highly sophisticated, item weighting was thought to be much more exact than necessary for the data.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL SCORES ON ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING (N=333)

SCORE	NUMBER
0	1
1	44
2	6
3	10
4	14
5	39
6	69
7	64
8	61
9	47
10	18

In an attempt to determine the usefulness of the measure of attitudes toward college-going as a variable representing attitudes about going to college, two additional steps were taken. The first was to compute a reliability coefficient. The Kuder-Richardson Reliability Coefficient was chosen, notwithstanding the fact that this coefficient, as a "kind of average of the various reliability coefficients which could be obtained from all the possible ways of subdividing the "m" test items," tends to underestimate the "true reliability coefficient."[1] The Kuder-Richardson formula was programmed for the IBM 1620 computer and a reliability coefficient of .55 was obtained. This coefficient was judged high enough to allow the attitude measure as a useful instrument.

---

[1] Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953) p. 312.

The second step was to make an attempt to judge the validity of the measure. The *a priori* discussion of the elements of positive attitudes about college-going identified four areas of possible parental support. Each of these four elements is represented by at least one item in "Attitudes Toward College-Going." Some face validity is therefore present.

Analysis of the responses of the eleven subjects in the pretest also gives support to the claim that the instrument does measure support for higher education. Of the eleven respondents, six were parents of children who had made an application to college and five were parents of children who had not. Among the former group the mean attitude score was 6.66 while among the latter the mean attitude score was 5.80 and no person in this group scored above 7. Thus, the attitude measure discriminated in the correct direction between these two groups although the number of respondents is too small to be more than suggestive of the difference.[1]

---

[1] It is recognized that a psychological interpretation using such a concept as cognitive dissonance would considerably reduce our faith in the findings. Those who had decided to not send to college would be expected to have rationalized their beliefs or to have altered their values in such a way that their scores would be depressed. Similarly, scores of parents whose children had decided to go to college would be accentuated. However, there is no way for me to estimate the effects of such a psychological shift.

Accepting the limitations of data based on the pre-test, one further attempt to speak to validity was made. A small co-educational liberal arts college was chosen as a pool of respondents. This college is expensive (annual per student cost is about $3,000) and very demanding (the average scores of its freshmen on national aptitude tests places it among the top 20 colleges in the country.) It was reasoned that blue collar parents would be required to provide substantial support for children who desired to attend this college. Accordingly, all blue collar parents of freshmen (N=61) in this college were sent a three page questionnaire including the original thirty-eight attitude items. Forty-two, or 69%, of the questionnaires were returned. These respondents were scored on the ten items of the attitude measure. Their mean score was 7.98. As with the pre-test sample, the direction of the difference, when compared to the total sample (mean score of 6.75) gives evidence that the measure differentiates positive attitudes about college attendance.

Finally, the scores on Attitude Toward College-Going for the total sample of 333 were related to the scores on the Admissions Index. By dichotomizing the attitude measure at a score of 7 (the median) and by dichotomizing the Admissions Index at a score of 3 a Yule's Q was computed.[1] The association was positive and significantly different from zero at a level of 95% (Q=.34). Evidence of concurrent validity is therefore offered.

---

[1] G. C. Yule, "On Methods of Measuring Association Between Two Attributes," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 1912, 75, pp. 579-642.

This study will therefore use two dependent variables, operationally defined as the Admissions Index and Attitudes Toward College-Going.

Independent Variables

As defined in Chapter I, there are five clusters of independent variables deriving from four environments. These are: social background; the informal social environment; the work environment; and the environment of voluntary non-work organizations. Each of these was operationally defined by responses to questions in the interview schedule.[1]

A. Social Background

Social background was defined operationally by using the major occupational group of the respondent's own father: that is, farmer, blue collar worker, blue collar foreman, owner of a small business and white collar worker. The educational levels of the respondent and his wife were also obtained. In both cases, educational level was dichotomized to differentiate between persons who had at least finished high school and those who had not.

---

[1] The indicators compiled for this research represent an attempt to reduce attribute spaces to manageable proportions. Reduction has as its goal the classification of several discrete, though related, attributes, so that different combinations of the attributes will fall into comparable classes. Three kinds of reduction can be distinguished: the functional, the arbitrary numerical, and the pragmatic. In a functional reduction there must exist an actual relationship among the attributes. The arbitrary numerical construct is "best exemplified by index numbers. In the analysis of housing conditions, for instance, the following procedure is frequently used: Several items, such as plumbing, central hearing, and refrigeration are selected as especially indicative, and each is given a certain weight. Central hearing and a refrigerator in a house without plumbing might be equivalent to plumbing without the other two items, and therefore both cases get the same index numbers. Of course, the weights for such procedure can originate in different ways." (Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Allen H. Barton, "Qualitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification, Typologies and Indices," in The Policy Sciences, edited by Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 1951, p. 173.) In the case of pragmatic reduction, certain combinations are made to serve research purposes. Because the analysis employed in

B. The Informal Social Environment

Each respondent was asked to give selected information about his two best friends and the neighbor with whom he most often interacts. Three indicators were compiled; one for each of his two friends and one for his neighbor. The information was weighted as follows: The friend's or neighbor's occupational prestige was weighted by ten point intervals and ranged from one point if the occupation were in the 49 and below category to five points if the occupation were in the 80 and above category.[1] Four additional points were given if the friend or neighbor were a white collar worker, and one point if the person were a foreman.[2] The friend's

---

this study utilizes nominal measures, and because these measures are dichotomized, the arbitrary numerical method of index construction was thought adequate. No claim can be made that an analysis which assumes that scores represent equal interval distinctions would be appropriate.

[1] The Duncan (NORC) prestige scores were used to rank the friend and neighbor, op. cit.

[2] Four points were assigned to white collar status to accentuate that attribute. The highest score attainable by a blue collar foreman is 10, while the lowest probable score for a white collar worker is 11. Thus the score effectively discriminates between blue collar and white collar status, although there is some overlap between the scores of 8 and 11 for the neighbor and between 7 and 11 for the friend.

or neighbor's reported educational attainment was weighted from one point for no formal schooling or no information, to five points for having completed college. In addition, one point was given if the friend or neighbor was definitely planning to, or had sent his own children to college. The possible range was from 2 to 15 and was dichotomized at 7 and above for both friends and 8 and above for the neighbor, the scores which were the first above the computed medians.

Reported frequency of interaction with friends was not found to be relevant. Reported frequency of contact with the neighbor was also not used, although with some hesitation. However, analysis of the information obtained when the respondent reported less than one contact a month with the neighbor revealed that he was generally unable to provide the educational level of the neighbor and very often was able to provide only a vague job title. It was thought that subsequent analysis would not be affected by this omission, since infrequent or only casual contacts with a white collar group would be unlikely to afford a blue collar worker a referent. This would be particularly the case if the outward symbols of white collar status, such as quality of home or automobile, were not significantly different from the symbols of the blue collar worker's own status.

C. The Work Environment

There are two main components of the work environment: the activity-specific; and, the negotiable. The activity-specific variable is further broken into two sub-components; what I have called Job Content, and patterns of inter-action in the work place. Job Content is a weighted index composed of responses to Questions 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35 and 36. As such, it includes questions about perceived educational requirements to do one's job well, perception of the requirement to learn new skills to maintain or enhance one's position, the necessity to read or to perform mathematical operations and the number of men one supervises. Points were assigned to men who thought their jobs were interesting and autonomous, men who supervised others, men who thought they would have to learn new skills in one year or less, men who thought their jobs required more than a high school education for a high level of performance and to those who read or used mathematics at least once a week. Perception that one's job required a college education, supervision of five or more other persons, and believing that one must learn new skills on one year or less were each scored by assigning 4 points to the attribute. Having an interesting and autonomous job were given the next highest scores of 3 and reading or using mathematics were given scores of 2. The rationale for this assignment of scores was that supervising other persons represents a qualitatively different skill than manipulating things, and one similar to many positions occupied by middle class persons.

Perception that a college education is required for a high level of performance in a blue collar position indicates, I think, that the occupant has inflated the skill demands of his position to the extent that he believes that his own children will need a college education simply to stay even with his level. Believing that one must learn new skills in a year or less also reflects a perception of the work-role as a continually more demanding one, requiring constant preparation. Such perception might well be reflected in a desire to have one's children well prepared before entering a work role. A person who answers only these three questions in a positive manner will thus be placed in the "high" group, but it is not necessary to do so in order to obtain a "high" score.[1] Interpretation of the data is not, then, restricted to only these three elements as contributing to a high score on the index of Job Content. The possible range of scores for Job Content is from 0 to 22 and the median for this sample is between 9 and 10. The variable was thus dichotomized as those who were above the median and those who were not.

Personal interactions in the work place are also activity-specific in nature. Equal points were given if one talked with or was supervised by white collar workers. Additional points were given if a person reported that white collar workers were personal friends. The scoring was weighted to give three points for contact, an additional three points for frequent interaction and an additional two points for friendship. Because both one's immediate superior and white collar worker in general were scored, the possible range is from 0 to 16. The median was between 4 and 5 and the index was dichotomized to differentiate those with scores above 4 and those who did not score above 4.

The second main component of the work environment are the negotiable aspects of an occupation. Operationally, negotiable components of an occupation include job prestige, level of income and a measure of job security comprising what I have called a Career Index. The Career Index attempts to measure perceived job security during the time the respondent's child was about to enter and actually in high school. It was reasoned that this was the period of time during which college decisions begin to be made, and it is during this time that perceived or actual job security allows long range planning on the part of the respondent. Consequently two points were assigned if the respondent had been in his present occupation for more than five years, two more points were given if he had been with his present firm for more than five years and two points for each time that he answered in the most positive fashion to questions about his perception of his chances for advancement, and three questions about different kinds of job security; internal to the firm, external to the firm but within his own occupational group and general security. One point was given for statements of average strength to the advancement and security questions. The possible range is from 0 to 12, and for the total sample the median score is between 8 and 9. The scores were dichotomized by grouping respondents who scored above the median, versus respondents who had not scored above the median. To be included in the "high" group, a blue collar worker would have to answer at least one of the advancement or security questions in the most positive manner, the other three in the average group, and have experienced specific job stability. A pattern of high upward mobility may be obscured by this scoring procedure, but several considerations reduce the concern. The most extreme form of mobility would be to move from a blue collar to a white collar position. Such a move would put the occupant of the white collar position out of consideration anyway.

---

[1] The reason for this is that the median score is 10 and a respondent answering positively the three items in question would be assigned a score of 12. However, a score of 10 or more could also be obtained by a respondent who thought his job was interesting (3 points) and autonomous (3 points) and who used mathematics and read at least once a week (4 points total).

Other manifestations of upward mobility would be from semi-or unskilled positions to skilled positions. The structure of skilled occupations mitigates against such mobility for men in this age category. The third type would be from rank and file worker to foreman. Again, the occupational structure would, I think, mitigate against such moves except within the same firm. The pattern most likely to be obscured is one of moving in the last five years from one foremanship to another, having been a foreman less than a total of five years. To guard against losing the significance of such a move, separate analysis was made of all foremen, regardless of how long they had been in their present positions.

D. The Environment of Voluntary Non-Work Organizations

Participation, or the Activity Index, was defined with reference to the responses to three questions; "In what two organizations are you most active?", "How often do you attend meetings?", and "Have you ever been elected to an office or served on a committee?" The organizations were divided into two groups. The criterion for division was whether or not the organization would be likely to have in its membership both blue collar and white collar workers. The former were called "Model Expansive," and membership in such a group was given six points. "Model Expansive" organizations were judged to include community welfare organizations such as the Lions Club, political organizations, and school-related organizations. "Model Restrictive" organizations were defined as labor unions, social or athletic clubs, brotherhoods, and church membership. Church-related clubs, such as men's clubs, were defined as "Model Expansive." One point was given for frequent attendance and one point for leadership.

The possible range for the Activity Index is 0 to 16. The median for the sample is between 4 and 5. The variable was dichotomized to represent those above four and those not above four.

Data will be presented in Chapters III and IV which will explicate the relationships between the two dependent variables and the four environments chosen for this study.

CHAPTER III

THE FINDINGS: ATTITUDES

Introduction

There exists in the United States a generalized belief that college attendance is important for future success. The blue collar workers in this study subscribe to this belief. Over 90% of all respondents said that they definitely wanted their children to go to college. The age and sex of the child had no effect on this desire. However, there were some differences between expressed desire and expectations. Sixty-eight percent of the fathers of tenth and eleventh grade students and 78% of the fathers of twelfth grade students said that they expected that their children would go to college. Of some interest is that expectation levels are lower than desires, but may rise over time as a child successfully completes the first three years of high school. Of more interest, however, is the high level of expectancy. Although 78% of the fathers of twelfth grade students expect that their children will go to college, other data will show that a smaller percent have taken any action which might be termed supportive or purposeful.

Parental involvement in the decision to go to college appears rather superficial among these blue collar workers. When asked whether there were any colleges to which they would object as potential institutions for their children, as many as 90% of the fathers answered that there were none. As Table 11 shows there are differences based on the sex and grade level of the child but these are not important.

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF FATHERS ABLE TO NAME UNSUITABLE COLLEGES FOR THEIR CHILDREN

SEX OF CHILD	GRADE LEVEL		
	10 (N=147)	11 (N=91)	12 (N=95)
Male	12%	22%	10%
Female	14%	27%	23%

On the other hand, as much as 35% of the sample group of fathers could name no schools which they would choose for their children if given the opportunity (Table 12). Again, differences according to the sex and grade of the child are apparent, but not important.

TABLE 12

PERCENT OF FATHERS HAVING NO POSITIVE CHOICE OF COLLEGE

SEX OF CHILD	GRADE LEVEL		
	10 (N=147)	11 (N=91)	12 (N=95)
Male	35%	19%	19%
Female	36%	20%	28%

Although an increased awareness of valuable or desirable educational institutions would seem to take place as the child moves through high school, this is a rather unsophisticated form of desire. Coupled with an unwillingness or inability to name unsuitable colleges, this indicates perhaps a very limited knowledge base from which to give the child advice. Further, those naming positive choices did so in a way which is predictable and may indicate a lack of knowledge of alternatives.[1] Fathers of twelfth grade boys chose the University of Illinois and fathers of twelfth grade girls chose both the University of Illinois and the several state teachers training colleges. Table 13 shows the distribution of choices for fathers of twelfth grade students.

TABLE 13

POSITIVE COLLEGE CHOICES OF FATHERS OF TWELFTH GRADE STUDENTS

College Choice	Boys (N=42)	Girls (N=53)
Junior College	9%	16%
Teachers' Colleges	6	22
University of Illinois	36	24
University (Out of state)	15	10
Liberal Arts College (In state)	2	2
Liberal Arts College (Out of state)	2	2
"Prestige" College	21	14
Religious College	9	10
	100%	100%

Fathers of girls tend to choose about equally between the University of Illinois and the various state teachers' colleges, whereas the fathers of boys tend to restrict their choices to the University of Illinois, and to a lesser extent, "prestige" colleges. These findings are not surprising in view of the instrumental orientation thought to be characteristic of blue collar workers. More simply, perhaps, the findings demonstrate that blue collar workers know the names of only a few colleges. Blue collar fathers of boys do have some ability to discriminate however, since only 15% chose either a junior college or a teacher's college, while 38% of the fathers of girls did so.

---

[1] See James Coleman, Peter Rossi, and Phillips Cutright, "Determinants and Consequences of College Choice," The National Opinion Research Center and the Department of Social Relations, The Johns Hopkins University, Chicago and Baltimore, 1964, for similar findings in a report prepared for the College Entrance Examination Board.

Although the fathers desire and expect college for their children a limited number have taken supportive action. The respondents were asked to identify three standard college entrance institutions: the Scholastic Aptitude Tests, the Illinois State Scholarship Program, and the College Scholarship Service. If a student seriously considers attending college these three terms will almost certainly enter into his decision process at some point since they represent sequential steps in most admissions procedures. It seems reasonable that if the decision to attend college were an important family matter, the fathers of such children would have at least a vague idea of the role of such agencies in the process. However, few fathers were able to identify any of these services. (Table 14).

TABLE 14

PERCENT OF FATHERS ABLE TO IDENTIFY:
(By Grade)

	Grade		
	10 (N=147)	11 (N=91)	12 (N=95)
Scholastic Aptitude Test	7%	14%	21%
Illinois State Scholarship Program	9	12	18
College Scholarship Service	18	14	18

As was the case with respect to positive college choice, as the child progresses through high school the parent appears to gain information. However, even in the twelfth grade such information is limited.

Although a parent may have strong desires that his child go to college, he may have only limited information of the steps required to gain admission. In such instances he can be expected to have made some plans or to have taken some action to gain information. When queried about what action they had taken, increased involvement is apparent, but again the overall level is low. Respondents were asked what plans they had made to send the child to college, including such simple items as "talked about it in the family." Of those fathers who had earlier said that they expected that their children would attend college, the percent who had made no plans is shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15

10 (N=100)	11 (N=62)	12 (N=74)
68%	58%	22%

The interesting point is not so much that more fathers of twelfth grade students than of tenth grade students had made plans, but that 22% of the twelfth grade fathers had not even discussed the possibility in the family, even though they expected the child to go to college.

One further suggestion of the relatively low level of involvement of these blue collar workers in decisions about college, is seen in the percent of families who had saved no money for college expenses. Fifty six percent of the fathers of twelfth grade students, 59% of the fathers of eleventh grade students and 64% of the fathers of tenth grade students had saved no money for college costs. If we remember that the median family income of this sample is $9,600 per year, saving for college would not seem beyond the economic ability of families committed to college educations for their children.

Finally, when asked who was active in helping the child plan, the father, the mother, or both together, only 8% of the fathers replied that they were more active than their wives. Thirty-five percent of the respondents said that their wives were more active than they.

In summary, these men subscribe to a generalized desire to send their children to college, but most have neither a high level of information of how to go about it, nor, seemingly, a strong commitment to do so. Such an interpretation may help us understand some of the differences in rates of college going for children of blue collar and white collar workers.

The Findings

Positive attitudes toward sending a child to college represent one element in what have been called "support for college-going." Generally, attitudes pre-exist behavior. In the case of becoming involved with a child in the decision to attend college, a desire that one's child do so very likely pre-exists supportive behavior of the type I have described. Coleman, Rossi and Cutright[1] in their report to the

---

[1] James Coleman, Peter Rossi and Phillips Cutright, op. cit.

College Entrance Examination Board, have shown that there is a high degree of agreement between a child's statement of his college plans at the beginning of high school and at the end. While a child thinks generally about college before entering high school, the intensive search begins about the time the child enters his last year of high school. At this stage we would expect that fathers also become more involved, and in fact this is the case in this research (Chapter II, page 42, this writing). However, as has been seen, parental desires for college do not fluctuate greatly as the child progresses in high school.

Social Background

The education which a man obtains establishes in large measure a man's access to social rewards. Occupational position, and consequently income, are generally considered to be dependent on educational level. Within a relatively homogeneous occupational group, such as blue collar workers, it might be argued that education discriminates less than it would between occupational groups. Those men occupying similar work roles would be expected to have similar educations. In a statistical analysis, if educational levels varied considerably, but occupational levels varied within a smaller range, a high degree of relationship between education and occupation would not be predicted. However, the blue collar work world is complex enough to admit distinctions among specific blue collar positions. We might expect, therefore, that even within the blue collar group some differences in educational level would be related to attributed prestige of the job in so far as the attribution of prestige depends on the assignment of levels of skill or on entry requirements.

Not surprisingly, among the sample of blue collar workers drawn for this study, prestige level of one's job is related to the level of one's education. Among fathers of boys, the zero order Gamma between educational level and occupational prestige is .3347, a figure which is significantly different from zero at the 95% level.[1] Among fathers of girls the comparable figure is .1155, a figure not different from chance expectations. Even though the relationship is statistically significant among fathers of boys it is not impressively high. The fact that neither figure is not higher may be attributed to the relative occupational homogeneity of the population.

Likewise, the zero order Q between education and income is .17 for fathers of boys and .12 for fathers of girls. Neither figure is significantly different from what could be expected if chance alone were operating. Further, the zero order Gammas between income level and occupational prestige are .1382 for fathers of boys and .0627 for fathers of girls, neither of which figure is significantly different for zero.

It may be that within any single status group, such as, in this case, more skilled blue collar workers, such traditional sociological variables as income, education and occupational prestige cannot account for differences in behavior and beliefs. I have chosen to examine a population in which variance on the above variables is not as great as if I were examining the total occupational spectrum.

---

[1] Please see Appendix B of this dissertation for a statement of the statistical treatments employed in the study.

Consequently, the level of analysis is somewhat different, and difference in behavior and beliefs must be explained in other terms. This is not to deny that occupational level, for instance, would not be a powerful variable in another context. But in the context of this study, it is not expected to be as important.

In other studies, educational level has been shown to be a powerful predictor of attitudes toward education. I have hypothesized that the educational level of a blue collar worker will be independently related to his attitudes toward a college education for his children. Table 16 presents the zero order relationship between educational level and attitudes toward college going among fathers of boys and girls.

TABLE 16

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING

Attitudes Toward College-going	Educational Level	
	High School Graduate or More (N=162)	Some High School or Less (N=171)
High	65%	49%
Low	35	51
	100%	100%

Q=.32*

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

However, among fathers of boys the relationship is significantly different from that which obtains among fathers of girls. Table 17 and 18 demonstrate the two relationships.

TABLE 17

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

Attitudes Toward College-going	Educational Level High School Graduate or More (N=86)	 Some High School or Less (N=77)
High	72%	45%
Low	28	55
	100%	100%

Q=.52*

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

TABLE 18

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

Attitudes Toward College-going	Educational Level High School Graduate or More (N=76)	 Some High School or Less (N=94)
High	57%	52%
Low	43	48
	100%	100%

Q=.10

Although the relationship between educational level and positive attitudes toward college-going is not a significant one among fathers of girls, education will later be shown to act as a mediating variable.

Among fathers of boys, educational level appears to be a strong indicator of attitudes toward college going. This is not surprising, in view of the demands made by society on a male. A blue collar worker, no less than any other father, desires that his son be at least as successful as he himself has been. If he attributes any of his own success to his education, or his lack of success to his lack of education, he will desire as much or more education for his son. However, the ability to conceptualize a college education and its probable outcome may be beyond the capacity of a man who has never finished high school. To him, graduation from high school is probably the most likely goal hoped-for for his son. To a high school graduate, the next step up for his son will be represented by some form of college training.

This relationship, however, may be due to other factors. A better educated blue collar worker may have a better job, although, as has been shown, income level is not related in this sample to education. Occupational prestige, to the degree that variable represents quality of job, has been shown to be related to educational level. If we control for occupational prestige, the relationship between education and attitudes toward college-going is unaffected (Table 19).

TABLE 19

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, STANDARDIZED ON OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE[1]

Attitudes Toward College-going	Educational Level High School Graduate or More (N=86)	 Some High School or Less (N=77)
High	69%	48%
Low	31	52
	100%	100%

Q=.41*

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

---

[1] See Appendix B for a description of the process of standardization as used in this research.

However, within the table of partials there are two relationships which are suggestive of the effect of education. Among those fathers in the lowest occupational prestige group (occupational prestige scores below 50), the relationship between educational level and attitudes is -.14. Since there are only 11 cases this figure is subject to great sampling error, but it appears that a high school graduate without a very prestigeful job is unlikely to view advanced education as a particularly valuable possession within the work world.

The other relationship, based on 42 cases, occurs among the group of men who have jobs in the next higher prestige category (occupational prestige scores between 50 and 60). These men have such jobs as truck driving, lathe operation and similar semi-skilled positions. Within this group the relationship between education and positive attitudes is positive and at a Q level of .65. Thus, men who have a high school education or more, but are employed in a semi-skilled job perhaps view a college education as necessary for their own sons if they are to be more successful than their fathers.

Another way of examining the effect of education, controlled by level of occupation, is to use the status of foreman as a control. The standardized relationship is shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, STANDARDIZED ON FOREMAN STATUS

	Educational Level	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High School Graduate or More (N=86)	Some High School or Less (N=77)
High	73%	48%
Low	37	52
	100%	100%

Q=.49*

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Thus, among fathers of boys, educational level and positive attitudes toward college-going appears related, independent of two occupational measures, prestige and foreman status. Among fathers of girls, education and positive attitudes are not related. It will be shown later that among fathers of boys educational level has a strong relationship to positive attitudes, independent of other independent variables.

A second background variable predicted to be related to attitudes is the educational level of his wife. Many studies have shown the powerful effect of a mother's education on the performance and aspirations of her child. It is not unreasonable to expect that a wife's education would affect her husband's beliefs. For the data of this study the expected relationship does not obtain (Table 21).

TABLE 21

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT'S WIFE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS AND GIRLS

Attitudes Toward College-going	Education of Respondent's Wife: High School Graduate or More (N=211)	Education of Respondent's Wife: Some High School or Less (N=122)
High	61%	51%
Low	39	49
	100%	100%

Q=.20

The appropriate figure of Q for fathers of boys is .20 and for fathers of girls is .22, neither of which is significant from chance expectations.

One explanation for this unpredicted finding is that among blue collar workers the male family role is one of dominance rather than of shared influence as with white collar workers. The blue collar male acts somewhat independently of his wife; friendship patterns, for instance tend to be restricted to members of the same sex rather than shared. Thus, the wife's influence on her husband's beliefs might be lower than in a white collar environment, particularly when there are no gross discrepancies between their educations.

While the educational levels of husband and wife in this sample are not identical, they are similar. The zero order product moment correlation between the educational level is .34, which is significantly different from zero. Too few cases of gross discrepancy (for example, the case where the wife has a college degree and the husband has a high school diploma) were obtained to treat statistically.

However, what evidence is available suggests that when the difference is that great, the father is highly likely to express positive attitudes toward college attendance.

One other possible explanation, for which data are not directly available, is that the husband makes the decision when his son is concerned and allows his wife to make the decision with reference to a daughter. This would explain, in part, the lack of relationship between the respondent's own education and his attitudes toward college for his daughter.

On the basis of the above data we are unable to accept or reject Hypothesis 1 in its entirety. Instead we can speak of education being related to attitudes about college for fathers of boys. For neither boys nor girls is the education of the wife related to the respondent's attitudes.

A third background variable predicted to be related to attitudes toward college-going was the occupation of the respondent's father. This variable was categorized by five groups: farmers, all blue collar workers, all blue collar foremen, owners of small businesses and all white collar workers. It was argued that the occupation of one's father partly determined one's educational level and one's own point of entry into a work role. On another level, the occupation of one's father determines in some measure his attitudes, which he then to some degree may instill in his son. As can be seen from Table 22, controlling for the respondent's own educational level, there is no significant relationship between the respondent's attitudes and the occupation of the respondent's father among fathers of boys.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S FATHER AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	Occupation of Respondent's Father				
Attitudes Toward College-going	White Collar (N=19)	Owner of Small Business (N=11)	Blue Collar Foreman (N=8)	Blue Collar (N=99)	Farmer (N=27)
High	68%	75%	74%	53%	64%
Low	32	25	26	47	36
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma=.1210

Thus, if the occupation of the respondent's father has an effect on his attitudes it would seem to operate only indirectly, possibly by having affected his educational level.

Among fathers of girls, there is a relationship. Within this group the occupation of the respondent's father is related to the respondent's attitudes independently of the respondent's educational level. (Table 23)

TABLE 23

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S FATHER AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS, CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	Occupation of Respondent's Father				
Attitudes Toward College-going	White Collar (N=21)	Owner of Small Business (N=10)	Blue Collar Foreman (N=14)	Blue Collar (N=99)	Farmer (N=26)
High	72%	60%	78%	52%	39%
Low	28	40	22	48	61
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma=.3424

The finding of Table 23 provides some indirect support for the argument presented as an explanation of the failure of Hypothesis 1 with reference to fathers of girls. Women may marry men who represent, among other things, potential for economic support. Before a man has established himself occupationally, his father is perhaps the best symbol of his eventual position in the eyes of a prospective wife. Thus, a woman may see in her father-in-law's occupation a source of family status and may wish the same higher status for her daughter. She may, then, put pressure on her husband to send their daughter to college so that the daughter will be given a chance to marry a man with a college education. There is also the possibility that a man wishes to compensate for his failure to provide his wife with as high a status as that of his own mother, and therefore attempts to give the higher status to his daughter by sending her to college.

On the basis of the analysis Hypothesis 2, that there will be a relationship between social origins which reflect higher status and attitudes toward college-going, can neither be rejected nor accepted.

Friendship Patterns

I have argued that a man's friends can have an effect on his attitudes and his behavior. More specifically, one is likely to share the attitudes to which one's friends subscribe. In the case of blue collar workers, high status friends and neighbors represent both sources of attitudes and of information. In addition, they represent occupational alternatives for children. If a man generally desires a college education for his children, as 90% of the men in this sample say they do, having friends who have higher status or who have higher educations is an advantage as a source of information about the college-going process.

But with respect to attitudes about going to college the effect of high status friends is somewhat problematic. Friendships are sustained in many ways; agreement about the value of college need not be one of them. Blue collar workers might also be expected to choose as friends other blue collar workers. In these latter friendships the value of going to college would be even less likely to be a major subject of required agreement, or even of discussion. However, if a blue collar worker has a white collar friend, the value of college attendance might be a more salient area of accord, particularly if the blue collar worker has himself at least graduated from high school. Table 24 presents data relevant for this possible differential relationship.

TABLE 24

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATUS OF FRIEND AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS, CONTROLLING FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
	Status of Friend		Status of Friend	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=90)	Low (N=72)	High (N=85)	Low (N=86)
High	71%	58%	55%	45%
Low	29	42	45	55
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.27*		Q=.20	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

However, if we consider the sex of the child as possibly affecting the father's attitudes toward college-going, the observed relationship is altered. Among fathers of boys, for instance, the data are striking (Table 25).

TABLE 25

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATUS OF FRIEND AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
	Status of Friend		Status of Friend	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=60)	Low (N=26)	High (N=28)	Low (N=49)
High	78%	57%	50%	42%
Low	22	43	50	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.46*		Q=.16	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

The zero order relationship between attitudes and the status of the friend is .41, and the standardized relationship is .30. As can be seen the status of the friend is generally related to the respondent's attitudes toward college-going for his son, but the general relationship masks the intensifying effect of education in this relationship. There is some reason to suggest the following phenomena; if a man has at least a high school education, having a white collar friend may reinforce his already positive attitudes about the value of college. If, on the other hand, he has not graduated from high school, simply having a white collar friend will not be enough to induce him to have positive attitudes about college. If a comparison of percentages of those men who have high attitudes is made across four groups, the intensifying effect of education becomes somewhat more clear.

TABLE 26

PERCENTAGE OF MEN WHO HAVE HIGH ATTITUDES AMONG THOSE WHO HAVE:

High education, high status friend	73%
High education, low status friend	57%
Low education, high status friend	50%
Low education, low status friend	42%

Among fathers of girls none of these relationships obtain. The zero order relationship between the status of the friend and the respondent's attitudes toward college is only .10, a figure of Q which could be obtained if chance alone were operating. The partial tables, controlled for educational level of the respondent are presented in Table 27.

TABLE 27

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATUS OF FRIEND AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS, CONTROLLING FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
	Status of Friend		Status of Friend	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=42)	Low (N=34)	High (N=48)	Low (N=46)
High	64%	50%	48%	54%
Low	36	50	52	46
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.28		Q=-.08	

As in the case of fathers of boys the direction of the intensifying effect of education on the relationship is apparent, but the relationship is statistically insignificant. Thus, if one has a daughter, one's attitudes toward her attendance at college seem not to be influenced by the same factors as if one had a son.

The relationship between the status of one's neighbor and one's attitudes toward college is equally problematic. Interaction with a neighbor can occur on a very superficial level. Agreement, or even discussion, about the value of college need never be an issue. However, if one's own education is relatively high one might turn to a neighbor for support, assuming that a higher education is related to positive attitudes, as has been shown. This might particularly be the case if one thought that the neighbor was of high enough status to provide guidelines for one's own nascent beliefs. Table 28 demonstrates that there is a relationship between neighbor status and attitudes among fathers of boys, and that this relationship is intensified by educational level.

TABLE 28

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STATUS OF THE NEIGHBOR AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
	Status of Neighbor		Status of Neighbor	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=52)	Low (N=34)	High (N=34)	Low (N=43)
High	80%	58%	42%	48%
Low	20	42	58	52
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.49*		Q=-.13	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among fathers of boys with a high school education the relationship is as expected. But among fathers of boys with less than a full high school education the relationship is reversed, although it is of such a small magnitude as to be only suggestive. A possible explanation is that a man who has not graduated from high school but who has "done as well as" his higher status neighbor, may feel that a college education just is not necessary for success. He sees around him better educated white collar workers who have the same style of life as he has, in so far as a superficially comparable house symbolizes a similar life style, talks with them about their problems and decides that college just is not worth the expense.

Among fathers of girls the relationship between the status of the neighbor and attitudes toward college-going are statistically insignificant (Table 29).

TABLE 29

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STATUS OF THE NEIGHBOR AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS, CONTROLLING FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
	Status of Neighbor		Status of Neighbor	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=39)	Low (N=37)	High (N=41)	Low (N=53)
High	61%	54%	53%	50%
Low	39	46	47	50
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.14		Q=.06	

Neither figure of Q is different from chance expectancies and leads us to speculate that if a blue collar worker has a college-age daughter he develops attitudes about the impending decision independently of any consideration of the ideas of his best friend or his neighbor.

It might be argued that the relationship between the status of the neighbor and positive attitudes toward college-going among fathers of boys results from either anticipatory socialization or selective migration to this particular suburb, or selective choosing of a neighbor. That is, a blue collar worker who supports his son's entrance into college will seek out a school district, and consequently a neighborhood and a specific neighbor, which will act to increase his child's chances of going to college. To attempt to answer whether or not selective migration occurs, each respondent was asked, in an open-ended question, why he chose to move into the suburb. Only 9% of all reasons given reflected in any way a concern for the child or his education. Even though the modal answer was couched in terms of the desire for more space, such an expressed reason may mask other more status-oriented concerns. The data do not allow me to answer this question directly.

However, one further bit of evidence supports a conclusion that selective migration did not occur. If it did occur, the relationship between the status of one's neighbor and one's own attitudes should not be affected by how long one has had that person as a neighbor. While I did not specifically obtain information about the tenure of a particular neighbor, I did obtain information about the length of residence, in the same house, of the respondent. If neighbors do not move in and out frequently, such data reflect the tenure of a neighbor also. As Table 30 shows, among fathers of boys, the relationship between the status of the neighbor and attitudes toward college-going is stronger the greater the length of residence in the suburb.

TABLE 30

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STATUS OF THE NEIGHBOR AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING FOR LENGTH OF RESIDENCE WITHIN THE SUBURB

	Lond Residence		Short Residence	
Attitudes Toward College-going	Status of Neighbor		Status of Neighbor	
	High (N=33)	Low (N=37)	High (N=47)	Low (N=46)
High	67%	35%	72%	58%
Low	33	65	28	42
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.58*		Q=.30	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

This finding is partly vitiated by the very low percentage of positive attitudes among long-term residents with lower status neighbors. It may be that this group represents a different kind of suburban dweller, one who moved to the suburb when the suburb was still "country" in order to escape the pressures of general society. I have no data which enables me to either refute or support this speculation.

The analysis of the relationships between the status of the friend or the status of the neighbor and attitudes toward college-going has led me to equivocal acceptance of another hypothesis, that among fathers of boys some influence of friends and neighbors on attitudes is suggested, but among fathers of girls no such influences were shown. No decision is made with respect to Hypothesis 3.

The Work Environment

Interaction patterns with a friend or a neighbor have been shown to be related to attitudes about the value of college attendance.

It might be expected that the persons with whom one interacts on the job would affect attitudes in the same manner. I have argued that being supervised by, or otherwise interacting with, white collar workers will be positively related to attitudes toward college. As Table 31 indicates, such is not the case.

TABLE 31

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ON THE JOB INTERACTION WITH WHITE COLLAR WORKERS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF

	BOYS		GIRLS	
Attitudes Toward College-going	Interaction High (N=77)	Interaction Low (N=86)	Interaction High (N=72)	Interaction Low (N=98)
High	56%	61%	50%	59%
Low	44	39	50	41
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=-.10		Q=-.18	

Neither figure is significantly different from zero and the results are somewhat surprising, but not entirely so. Studies in the sociology of occupations and industrial sociology have previously shown that the work place is not a particularly salient feature of a blue collar worker's total environment. "The job" represents a necessary evil to be endured until one can go home or elsewhere and enjoy one's leisure time. In addition, when asked what was discussed between themselves and white collar workers, less than 5% of the respondents made any mention of their children or their childrens' educations. The overwhelmingly frequent response to this question was, "Oh, just things such as the weather or sports." It is not beyond comprehension that attitudes about education would not be affected by such superficial relationships.

However, if the direction of the relationships in Table 31 is indicative of the direction of the actual relationships among other populations of blue collar workers, an interesting speculation is possible. A blue collar worker who is earning a fairly good wage, and who is satisfied with his station in life, when interacting with a white collar worker whose position in the work structure is not much higher than his own, may decide that a college education does not provide sufficient returns. His reason for so deciding is that he feels that he "knows" about white collar positions, and because bureaucracy mitigates against his having frequent contacts with white collar workers more than one or two steps above him in the hierarchy, he believes that white collar positions just are not that much better than his own. Unfortunately, I do not have data which would enable me to speculate from a firmer factual base.

Regardless of the interpretation, Hypothesis 4 must be rejected.

I have argued that attitudes about college-going would be subject to influences occasioned by the demands of a specific job. There are, however, two important aspects of this influence system; what one actually does, called in this study Job Content, and what formal authority one has, indicated by whether or not the respondent is a foreman. This latter status,among blue collar workers, affects income, on-the-job interaction, perhaps self-agrandisement, and is in turn possibly dependent on educational level, seniority and skills. Because it differs in kind from Job Content, being a foreman is treated separately. In so far as income and on-the-job interactions are not related to attitudes, being a foreman should not be. If it were, then the possibility would exist that there are effects from felt or attributed prestige or authority. As Table 32 demonstrates, the relationship between being a foreman and attitudes toward college-going is contingent upon the sex of the child.

TABLE 32

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOREMAN STATUS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS	
Attitudes Toward College-going	Foremen (N=33)	Non-foremen (N=130)	Foremen (N=39)	Non-foremen (N=131)
High	82%	54%	56%	54%
Low	18	46	44	46
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.58*		Q=.04	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among fathers of boys there appears to be something about the foremanship status which is related to having positive attitudes toward college-going. One can argue that a foremanship is awarded because of skills and other attributes which are related to positive attitudes, but that the foremanship is only a symbol of these other attributes. I have only one measure of this possibility; educational level of the respondent. As Table 33 shows, foremanship appears related to attitudes, independently of educational level.

TABLE 33

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOREMAN STATUS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING FOR EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
Attitudes Toward College-going	Foremen (N=17)	Non-foremen (N=69)	Foremen (N=16)	Non-foremen (N=61)
High	88%	68%	75%	39%
Low	12	32	25	61
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.55*		Q=.65*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Again the intensifying effect of educational level is seen. Among foremen without a full high school education, 75% have positive attitudes, while among foremen with a high school education or more, 88% have positive attitudes. However, foremanship seems independently related since among non-foremen with a high school education only 68% have positive attitudes. While Table 33 does not fully answer the problem of selection into a foreman's status, at least education is not one of the attributes which affects attitudes among persons so selected.

The other aspect of the influence system of work demands which I have chosen to investigate is what the man actually does. What has been called Job Content is an attempt to measure the extent to which the tasks which are performed approximate tasks of white collar workers. That is, to what extent are they intellectual, rather than manual in nature? Hypothesis 4 of this study has stated that the more closely a blue collar job approximates the demands of a white collar position, the more likely is its occupant to give support to a college education for his children. Table 34 demonstrates that the relationship depends on whether the child is a boy or a girl.

TABLE 34

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB CONTENT AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS	
	Job Content		Job Content	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=77)	Low (N=86)	High (N=74)	Low (N=96)
High	60%	60%	65%	48%
Low	40	40	35	52
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.00		Q=.34*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

This differential relationship is both interesting and perplexing. Among fathers of girls the relationship is as predicted and is not affected by educational level and foremanship as combined controls, as seen in Table 35 (there is no real reason to predict that either of the two controls would affect the relationship, since neither of them was itself related to attitudes.)

TABLE 35

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB CONTENT AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND FOREMANSHIP

	Job Content	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High	Low
High	65%	47%
Low	35	53
	100%	100%

Q=.34*

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among fathers of boys the presentation of the data masks what may be an effect of status discrepancy. Table 36 shows the percentages of men having positive attitudes toward college-going among four combinations of the education and job content attributes.

TABLE 36

PERCENTAGE OF FATHERS OF BOYS EXPRESSING POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG THOSE WHO HAVE:

High school degree, high content job	70%
High school degree, low content job	74%
Some high school, high content job	43%
Some high school, low content job	49%

Perhaps those men who have graduated from high school, but who have a low content job feel that if only they had had more education they would have been able to secure a better job. Those without a high school degree and a low content job may also feel that if they had had a better education they would have had a better job. In both cases, this feeling becomes an influence in pushing their sons to more education. However, the influence of Job Content is not very great. One explanation is that among fathers of boys, status enhancement is the motivation of pushing a son toward college and Job Content is not a variable which measures visible job status.

Among fathers of girls, status enhancement may not be so easily transferred from the man's work world to plans for a daughter. In fact, if the decision about college attendance for a daughter derives primarily from the mother, a wife may translate her husband's reported work activity into status terms. That is if a wife knows that her husband performs tasks which she perceives as similar to those performed by a white collar worker, she can extrapolate to the kind of husband she would like for her daughter. Going to college may represent one method of assuring an advantageous marriage for her daughter. This speculation receives some weak support from the fact that 65% of the fathers of girls who have high educations and high content jobs have positive attitudes, while 65% of those with low educations but high content jobs also have positive attitudes. But the speculation must be viewed as highly tentative.

Hypothesis 5 can now be restated in the following terms: among fathers of boys, visible status is related to positive attitudes toward college-going; among fathers of girls the internal, less visibly prestige-related, elements are related to positive attitudes toward college-going.

In Chapter I, I argues that the negotiable components of an occupation were unlikely to influence attitudes directly. Rather, they were thought to act as mediating variables which might prohibit other relationships. As seen in Table 37 and 38 there is no significant direct relationship between positive attitudes toward college-going and level of income.

TABLE 37

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF INCOME AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

Income Level[a]

Attitudes Toward College-going	Over 14 (N=15)	12-14 (N=12)	11-12 (N=16)	10-11 (N=35)	9-10 (N=24)	8-9 (N=26)	7-8 (N=13)	6-7 (N=13)	Under 6 (N=9)
High	73%	50%	63%	60%	57%	65%	38%	53%	44%
Low	27	50	37	40	43	35	62	47	56
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma = .1251

[a] Income level is recorded in thousands of dollars.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF INCOME AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

Income Level[a]

Attitudes Toward College-going	Over 14 (N=12)	12-14 (N=15)	11-12 (N=14)	10-11 (N=26)	9-10 (N=31)	8-9 (N=23)	7-8 (N=25)	6-7 (N=14)	Under 6 (N=10)
High	66%	40%	57%	53%	54%	43%	60%	64%	70%
Low	34	60	43	47	46	57	40	36	30
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma = .0751

[a] Income level is recorded in thousands of dollars.

Among fathers of boys there may be a threshold income level (about $8,000) below which planning for college is impossible. However, since income and education are related, the lower percentage of positive attitudes among lower income fathers is probably an artifact of their lower educations.

Among fathers of girls there is a high percentage of positive attitudes at the lower level of income. This may be due to a wife's pressure on her husband to send their daughter to college so that she will be able to marry someone likely to earn a higher income. Again, this speculation is unsubstantiated by the available data, but seems a reasonable avenue for further research.

The prestige of an occupation was also argued to not have a direct effect on attitudes toward college-going. Among fathers of boys, this is not the case (Table 39).

TABLE 39

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	Occupational Prestige Score			
Attitudes Toward College-going	Over 70 (N=46)	60-69 (N=64)	50-59 (N=42)	40-49 (N=7)
High	74%	61%	41%	60%
Low	26	39	59	40
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma = .3503

The relationship appears to be curvilinear, prompting the following speculation. Among fathers of boys with relatively high prestige jobs, college-going is either seen as necessary for status maintenance, or some attributes of a man which enable him to secure a good position also are those which influence him to value education for his son. This latter interpretation suffers some from the fact that education is not, apparently, one of the influential attributes, since controlling for education does not affect the relationship (the zero order Gamma is .3476, not different from .3503).

Among men with the lowest prestige scores education may be viewed as a way for sons to have better chances than the fathers have had. Here upward mobility would seem to operate. Among the men with medium prestige jobs, college-going does not seem to be as important as among the other groups. These may be men who are fairly secure economically and who feel that college is not necessary for success.

Among fathers of girls there is no relationship between job prestige scores and attitudes toward college-going (Table 40).

TABLE 40

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

	Occupational Prestige Scores				
Attitudes Toward College-going	Over 70 (N=33)	60-69 (N=76)	50-59 (N=53)	40-49 (N=6)	Under 40 (N=3)
High	57%	53%	56%	66%	33%
Low	43	47	44	34	67
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma = .0015

The small number of men with prestige scores below 50 does not permit any attempt to interpret the findings for that group. One possible speculation is that among fathers of boys a low prestige job serves as impetus to push a son, but that among fathers of girls no such push is worth the economic risk since the returns to a girl from a college education are not as easily transferred to the whole family. However, I conclude that occupational prestige scores are unrelated to attitudes toward college-going among fathers of girls.

A final negotiable component of the work environment is the security of a man's position, or what was called the "Career Index."

Like income and occupational prestige, security of position may serve as a mediating variable. Among fathers of boys, no relationship obtains (Table 41).

TABLE 41

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECURITY OF POSITION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

	Security of Position	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=73)	Low (N=90)
High	59%	59%
Low	41	41
	100%	100%

Q=.00

Among fathers of girls, however, there is a relationship (Table 42).

TABLE 42

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECURITY OF POSITION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

	Security of Position	
Attitudes Toward College-going	High (N=68)	Low (N=102)
High	65%	49%
Low	35	51
	100%	100%

Q=.30

Among fathers of girls relative security of position may allow family planning which includes a college education for the daughter. If the wife is the motivating force in a daughter's college plans she may gauge the family's ability to support such plans on the basis of the perceived security of the family rather than on the basis of actual income. Her reasoning may be that the family has managed to make it so far, and that it appears the husband will continue to be employed. Therefore, the family can probably manage a college education for the daughter. She then begins to exert pressure on the husband to agree to send the daughter to college.

Hypothesis 6, thus, receives contingent support. Among fathers of boys the visible status characteristic of occupational prestige is related to positive attitudes toward college-going. Among fathers of girls, job security appears to be related to positive attitudes. Only among fathers of boys does income appear to be related to positive attitudes.

In an attempt to explicate the findings presented so far in the study, an analysis developed by Coleman[1] was employed. The technique is explained in detail in Appendix B of this study. A separate analysis of fathers of boys and fathers of girls was performed. In each case the independent variables shown earlier to be significantly related to attitudes were used. The technique suggests relative effects of each significant variable, independent of the effect of each other independent variable. Among fathers of boys the following variables were included in the analysis; educational level, foremanship status, status of friend and status of neighbor. Occupational prestige had to be excluded from the analysis because of the small size of the sample. However, education is related to occupational prestige and foremanship represents part of the visible status of a blue collar job. The decision to exclude occupational prestige was made in the knowledge that some strength is lost from the analysis.

---

[1] James S. Coleman, Introduction to Mathematical Sociology (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964) Chapter 6.

TABLE 43

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AND FOUR SELECTED VARIABLES AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

Some High School or Less								High School Graduate or More							
Low Neighbor				High Neighbor				Low Neighbor				High Neighbor			
Low Friend		High Friend		Low Friend		High Friend		Low Friend		High Friend		Low Friend		High Friend	
Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen	Non-Foremen	Foremen
(15)	(6)	(12)	(4)	(8)	(2)	(14)	(4)	(14)	(2)	(13)	(5)	(10)	(2)	(31)	(11)
.80	.83	.16	.50	.37	.50	.42	1.00	.57	.50	.53	.60	.50	.50	.80	.90

The effect of each variable, weighted by the variance of each cell proportion, is as follows:

a_1 = Effect of foremanship = .1056 $P \{A_1 \leq 0\} < .0001$

a_2 = Effect of friend's status = .1373 $P \{A_2 \leq 0\} < .0001$

a_3 = Effect of neighbor's status = .0799 $P \{A_3 \leq 0\} < .001$

a_4 = Effect of education = .1070 $P \{A_4 \leq 0\} < .0001$

As yet there is no way to compute either random shocks toward or away from a positive state of the dependent variable with weighted data.

The effects for fathers of boys are all significant from zero, but their magnitudes cannot be compared one with another. As a result, the effects must be considered independent of the effects of each other variable.

Among fathers of girls the variables chosen for analysis were; occupational level of the respondent's father, job content of the respondent, and security of position, the only variables which were significantly related to positive attitudes. Table 44 shows the proportion in each category expressing positive attitudes toward college-going of girls.[1]

---

[1] In order to simplify the analysis, the occupation of the respondent's father was dichotomized into the following two groups; the low group was composed of farmers and all blue collar workers except foremen, the high group was composed of blue collar foremen, owners of small businesses and all white collar workers.

TABLE 44

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AND THREE SELECTED VARIABLES AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

Occupation of Respondent's Father (Farmers and Blue Collar Workers)				Occupation of Respondent's Father (Foremen, Owners of Small Businesses, White Collar Workers)			
Low Job Content		High Job Content		Low Job Content		High Job Content	
Low Security	High Security	Low Security	High Security	Low Security	High Security	Low Security	High Security
(48)	(28)	(28)	(22)	(14)	(6)	(12)	(12)
.37	.50	.53	.68	.64	.83	.67	.83

The effect of each variable, weighted by the variance of eash cell proportion, is as follows:

a_1 = Effect of job security = .1493 $P\{A_1 \leq 0\} < .0001$

a_2 = Effect of job content = .1209 $P\{A_2 \leq 0\} < .0001$

a_3 = Effect of occupation of respondent's father = .1981 $P\{A_3 \leq 0\} < .0001$

Again the variables are seen to be related independently to attitudes toward college-going, although nothing can be said about relative effects.

The Environment of Voluntary Non-work Organizations

It was thought that participation in non-work organizations is a symbol of the adoption of middle class attitudes. As such, participation in what were termed "model expansive" organizations should be related to the status of one's friend or neighbor. If participation is a middle class value and if one's neighbor or friend is middle class and if one adopts middle class attitudes, one will probably participate also. Table 45 shows the zero order and the standardized relationships between participation, or what is called the "Activity Index" and the status of the best friend.

TABLE 45

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACTIVITY INDEX AND STATUS OF FRIEND, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATION, STATUS OF NEIGHBOR, JOB CONTENT AND FOREMANSHIP

Score on Activity Index	ZERO ORDER Status of Friend High (N=177)	 Low (N=156)	STANDARDIZED Status of Friend High	 Low
Model Expansive	59%	46%	58%	51%
Model Restrictive	41	54	42	49
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.26*		Q=.14	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Table 46 shows the zero order and the standardized relationships between the status of the neighbor and the Activity Index.

TABLE 46

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACTIVITY INDEX AND STATUS OF NEIGHBOR, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATION, STATUS OF FRIEND, JOB CONTENT AND FOREMANSHIP

Score on Activity Index	ZERO ORDER Status of Neighbor High (N=158)	 Low (N=175)	STANDARDIZED Status of Neighbor High	 Low
Model Expansive	62%	45%	61%	47%
Model Restrictive	38	55	39	53
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.33*		Q=.28*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

As can be seen, using as controls those variables already shown to be related to attitudes toward college-going can reduce the relationship between the Activity Index and the status of the friend, but cannot substantially reduce the relation between the Activity Index and the status of the neighbor. This is not unexpected in view of the nature of most "model expansive" organizations named by the respondents in this sample. Respondents tended to name community-based "model expansive" organizations such as the Lions Club or local political groups. A man is therefore much more likely to be influenced by his neighbor than his friend, assuming that he is willing to be influenced at all. One measure of this effect is to compare the relationship between the status of the neighbor and the Activity Index with that between educational level and the Activity Index. The former zero order Q is .35 compared with a value of Q of .22 for the latter relationship. In addition, controlling for educational level alone reduces the relationship between the Activity Index and the status of the neighbor to only .31. We can conclude that having a high status neighbor may be an inducement to become involved in "model expansive" organizations.

Thus, Hypothesis 7, that there is a relationship between membership in voluntary non-work organizations and interaction with higher status friends or neighbors, can be accepted with respect to the status of the neighbor, but not with respect to the status of the friend.

The corollary of Hypothesis 7 stated that there would be no relationship between the Activity Index and attitudes toward college-going, controlling for friendship and neighbor statuses. The value of Q for the zero order relationship between the Activity Index and attitudes toward college-going is .16, necessitating no controls.

This lack of relationship offers support for Holden's thesis that non-work organizations, in most cases, should not be viewed as reference groups.[1] The corollary to Hypothesis 7 is thus accepted with respect to the relationship between the Activity Index and attitudes toward college-going.

Summary

In general the analysis suggests that among fathers of boys positive attitudes toward college-going are related to three elements of a man's total environment. The first of these is his own educational background, the second is the group of people with whom he interacts informally and socially, and the third are the visible prestige elements of his occupation. This last environment may be related to attitudes because of selection into the role, and therefore not representative of the effects of the internal structure of the work role. Instead, the influence of the work role may be due to other attributes which allow a man to select or be selected for the upper level of the blue collar work structure. Only preliminary data are presented to vitiate this interpretation; namely, that the work-related variables are related to attitudes independently of the man's own educational level. If other attributes do explain the work role influence they must be discovered through answers to questions about the man's skills and abilities, his motivation toward social mobility and his perception of his place within the social structure.

For fathers of girls the analysis has shown very few variables which are related to attitudes about college-going. The suggestion has been made that college decisions about girls are made by wives rather than husbands for the most part. The respondent's attributes which do show positive relationships to attitudes toward college are the performance of white collar-like tasks, security of position and the occupation of the respondent's own father. It was further suggested that if the wife played the larger role in planning for the daughter, these variables might be perceived by her as symbolic of the family's position in life. The husband's expressed attitudes are therefore interpreted as reflections of his wife's attitudes. No more than speculation seems possible, given the limitations of the data in this study.

---

[1] David F. W. Holden, *op. cit.*

In Chapter IV will be presented the findings relative to the second element of support for college-going; that is, supportive behavior.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS: BEHAVIOR

The second element of support for college education for one's child to be explored in this study is a measure of behavior. Each respondent was asked whether or not he had been involved with his child in several procedures associated with college entrance. These procedures included, among others, discussions within the family, reading college literature, visiting college campuses and making an application. Respondents who had done anything more than talk about college within the family or with friends were scored "high."

An argument has been presented to the effect that behavior is subject to more influences than are attitudes. In addition, if one of the reasons for only superficial involvement of blue collar fathers in the college going process is a lack of information, certain kinds of relationships would increase the probability that the blue collar worker would exhibit more knowledgable behavior. For example, having white collar neighbors might allow the respondent to turn to someone who has additional information. The behavior measure and status of the neighbor ought therefore to be related.

Using the same argument we should be able to predict those variables which would not have a major effect on the man's behavior. For example, what he does on his job probably cannot increase his store of information about how children get to college. As we have seen in some cases, what he does can affect what are his attitudes, which may in turn cause him to seek information, but he must turn to other sources for it.

In this chapter I will attempt to present data in support of the interpretation which I have just advanced.

Behavior, as well as attitudes, is undoubtedly affected by important events in a man's life and what I have chosen to call environments. But the specific behavior of becoming involved in a child's decision to attend college may also be dependent on the father's attitudes about college-going as a valuable experience. If he believes that a college education is valuable, he would be more likely to support necessary pre-college activity than if he questioned the value of college. Table 47 shows that there is a positive relationship between attitudes toward college-going and what has been called the Admissions Index among fathers of boys, but surprisingly not among fathers of girls.

TABLE 47

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AND SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS	
	ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE		ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE	
	HIGH (N=96)	LOW (N=67)	HIGH (N=94)	LOW (N=76)
SCORE ON ADMISSIONS INDEX				
HIGH	46%	24%	30%	22%
LOW	54	76	70	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .46*		Q = .18	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

The lack of relationship among fathers of girls is striking, but considering the sample as a whole may mask other relationships. The educational level of the respondent may be a mediating variable, in that those without a high school education may need the impetus of positive attitudes to become involved in the decision process. However, those men who at least have graduated from high school may be under pressure from their wives, or may feel social pressures to enhance their children's status by sending them to college. In that case, how a man actually feels about college may make no difference with respect to his actions, since they are influenced by forces other than his beliefs about the value of college per se. Rather, college is an outward manifestation of his ability to properly care for his family. In a sense, the culture expects him to send his child to college. Tables 48 and 49 present data which do not contradict this interpretation.

TABLE 48

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AND SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR MORE		SOME HIGH SCHOOL OR LESS	
	ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLEGE		ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLEGE	
SCORE ON ADMMISSIONS INDEX	HIGH (N=62)	LOW (N=24)	HIGH (N=35)	LOW (N=42)
HIGH	50%	41%	37%	14%
LOW	50	59	73	86
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .18		Q = 57*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

TABLE 49

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING AND SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS, CONTROLLING ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR MORE		SOME HIGH SCHOOL OR LESS	
	ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLEGE		ATTITUDE TOWARD COLLEGE	
SCORE ON ADMISSIONS INDEX	HIGH (N=44)	LOW (N=33)	HIGH (N=49)	LOW (N=45)
HIGH	34%	33%	27%	13%
LOW	66	67	73	87
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .02		Q = .39	

Social Background

While behavior has been shown to be related to attitudes, it is also related directly to events and experiences in a man's life. Among the experiences of a man's life his own education would be likely to have a major effect on how he behaved concerning college for his own child. Those men who have graduated from high school at least can reasonably be expected to seriously consider college for their children and to behave in a supportive fashion. In fact, the educational level of the respondents is associated with positive behavior, standardizing on their attitudes. That is, regardless of how they feel about college-going, if their education is high they will tend to behave in a supportive fashion, and if their education is low, they will tend not to behave in a supportive manner. Table 50 presents data with respect to this relationship.

The educational level of the respondent will later be used in an "effects" model and will be shown to be related independently of other variables.

TABLE 50

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS,[1] CONTROLLING FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING

	ZERO ORDER		STANDARDIZED	
	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL		EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	
SCORE ON ADMISSIONS INDEX	HIGH (N=162)	LOW (N=171)	HIGH	LOW
HIGH	41%	22%	40%	23%
LOW	59	78	60	77
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .42*		Q = .38*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level

The education of a man's wife may also be expected to influence his behavior. If his wife has a high school education she is likely to expect a college experience for her children. If so, she may put some pressure on her husband to do whatever he can to further her desires. Table 51 demonstrates that there is a relationship between the education of a respondent's wife and the extent to which he manifests supportive behavior, among fathers of boys. The relationship exists even though, as has been shown, his wife's education is not related to his attitudes.

This relationship persists even when the respondent's own educational level is controlled (Q=.61).

However, among fathers of girls no relationship obtains between the educational level of his wife and his supportive behavior (Table 52).

---

[1] Fathers of boys and girls were separately analyzed and no differences in the relationship were found.

TABLE 51

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS WIFE, AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

	EDUCATION OF WIFE	
SCORE ON ADMISSIONS INDEX	HIGH (N=99)	LOW (N=64)
HIGH	49%	17%
LOW	51%	83
	100%	100%

Q = .65*

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

. . . .

TABLE 52

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT'S WIFE AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

	EDUCATION OF WIFE	
SCORES ON ADMISSIONS INDEX	HIGH (N=111)	LOW (N=58)
HIGH	26%	27%
LOW	74	73
	100%	100%

Q = -.03

Two possible explanations for this differential relationship are offered. The first is that girls are expected to provide their own impetus for college-going, since as I have shown there is no relationship between a man's attitudes and his behavior with respect to his daughter (Table 47). The whole family, on the other hand may rally around a son, since he may represent the status aspirations of the family. The other explanation is mothers are closer to sons and fathers are closer to daughters. In this context the mother serves as the family support for the son's aspirations and the father serves the same role for the daughter. Thus, the higher relationship between the mother's education and supportive behavior among fathers of boys, and the higher relationship between the respondent's own education and supportive behavior, among fathers of girls.

While the educational level of the respondent and his wife are obviously important, other background characteristics of the respondent may be related. As Table 53 demonstrates there is a relationship between supportive behavior and the occupation of the respondent's father, but at a not very high level.

TABLE 53

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT'S FATHER[1]

SCORE OF ADMISSIONS INDEX	FARMER (N=54)	BLUE COLLAR (N=197)	BLUE COLLAR FOREMEN (N=21)	OWNER OF SMALL BUSINESS (N=19)	WHITE COLLAR (N=39)
HIGH	20%	29%	23%	36%	56%
LOW	80	71	77	64	44
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

GAMMA = .3153

Because of the relatively low value of Gamma and the difficulty of meaningfully combining the occupation of the respondent's father and the respondent's educational level, no further use will be made of the occupation of the respondent's father. Suffice it, that his father's occupation may have a bearing on his later behavior, but probably only indirectly, having influenced his earlier education and subsequent entry into the labor market.

---

[1] Fathers of boys and girls were analyzed separately and no significant differences were found.

On the basis of all of the above data we can conditionally accept Hypothesis 1, in that both the educations of the respondent and his wife are related to supportive behavior among fathers of boys. Only the respondent's education is related to supportive behavior among fathers of girls.

Hypothesis 2 is rejected because of the relatively low relationship between supportive behavior and the occupation of the respondent's father.

Friendship Patterns

The argument of Chapter I specified that interaction with white collar friends and neighbors will affect behavior as well as attitudes. Further, it was argued that friendships probably would be more powerful influences than interactions with neighbors with respect to behavior. Supportive behavior was thought to depend on access to sources of information. The respondent's own educational level may function as a source of knowledge, but so may his friends or his neighbors. In Table 54 the zero order and standardized relationships between supportive behavior and the status of the respondent's best friend are presented.[1]

TABLE 54

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND STATUS OF RESPONDENT'S BEST FRIEND, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	ZERO ORDER		STANDARDIZED	
	Status of Friend		Status of Friend	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=184)	Low (N=149)	High	Low
High	41%	20%	39%	20%
Low	59	80	61	80
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.47*		Q=.44*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

---

[1] Fathers of boys and fathers of girls were analyzed separately. For fathers of boys the zero order Q is .54 and for girls the zero order Q is .38. There is some reason to speculate about this difference, but since both are significant further analysis will be delayed until the end of this chapter.

The status of the friend appears to be independently related to supportive behavior and as will be shown later, this relationship persists when other variables are introduced as controls. However, if the relationship is due partly to the friend's possession of desired information, the relationship ought to be affected by whether or not the respondent desires the information. Using his attitudes toward college going as an indicator of the extent to which he may desire information, Table 55 presents data which do not contradict the interpretation.

TABLE 55

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND THE STATUS OF THE BEST FRIEND, HOLDING ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING CONSTANT

	HIGH ATTITUDES		LOW ATTITUDES	
	Status of the Friend		Status of the Friend	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=112)	Low (N=78)	High (N=72)	Low (N=71)
High	50%	20%	26%	16%
Low	50	80	74	84
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .59*		Q = .28	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among fathers of boys and fathers of girls taken as separate groups the relationships are comparable; for fathers of boys the Q values are .67 for high attitudes and .16 for low attitudes, and among fathers for girls the two values of Q are .46 and .21 respectively. If a man has positive attitudes about college but is unable to obtain information relevant for effecting his desires, his behavior may be limited to simply talking about college going within the family.[1] But if he has a high status friend he can turn to that friend for information. If, on the other hand, he has no real desire to send his child to college, having a friend with presumed information about the college-going process is not important since the information will not be called for.[1]

---

[1] Other factors such as his income may also limit his behavior to discussion, but these factors will be treated separately.

Much the same type of relationship is suggested with respect to the status of the neighbor. The relationship between the neighbor's status and supportive behavior is shown in Table 56, standardized on the educational level of the respondents.

TABLE 56

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND THE STATUS OF THE NEIGHBOR, STANDARDIZED ON THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENT

	ZERO ORDER		STANDARDIZED	
	Status of Neighbor		Status of Neighbor	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=160)	Low (N=173)	High	Low
High	41%	23%	39%	24%
Low	59	77	61	76
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .40*		Q = .34*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Table 57 shows the relationship when the respondent's own attitudes are held constant.

Having a high status neighbor, like having a high status friend, represents a potential source of information. If the respondent's attitudes are positive he may tap the source; if they are not positive, he need not be influenced in his behavior by his neighbor's status.

---

[1] There is a possibility that having a high status friend will subject him to certain pressures to behave in a supportive manner. However, only 26% of the fathers who have low attitudes but a high status friend so behave.

By combining the status of the friend with the status of the neighbor the relationship with behavior can be accentuated.[1] Again the effect of his own attitudes is seen (Table 58).

TABLE 57[2]

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND THE STATUS OF THE NEIGHBOR HOLDING ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING CONSTANT

	HIGH ATTITUDES		LOW ATTITUDES	
	Status of Neighbor		Status of Neighbor	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=102)	Low (N=88)	High (N=58)	Low (N=85)
High	49%	25%	25%	21%
Low	51	75	75	79
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .49*		Q = .13	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

TABLE 58[3]

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND COMBINED STATUS OF FRIEND AND NEIGHBOR, HOLDING ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING CONSTANT

	HIGH ATTITUDES			LOW ATTITUDES		
	Combined Score			Combined Score		
Score on Admissions Index	0 (N=55)	1 (N=56)	2 (N=79)	0 (N=45)	1 (N=66)	2 (N=32)
High	16%	35%	54%	20%	21%	31%
Low	84	65	46	80	79	69
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Gamma = .5294			Gamma = .1738		

---

[1] The combination was accomplished as follows: if a man had a high status friend and a high status neighbor he received a "score" of 2. If neither was high status the respondent's score is 0. All others received a score of 1.

[2] No significant differences between fathers of boys and fathers of girls were found. The values of Q among the high attitude group were .46 for fathers of boys and .50 for fathers of girls. Within the low attitude group the two values of Q were .05 for fathers of boys and .23 for fathers of girls.

[3] Fathers of boys and fathers of girls were analyzed separately. No significant differences were found.

On the basis of the analysis of the above data, Hypothesis 3, that there is a relationship between the status of persons with whom one interacts and one's supportive behavior is accepted conditionally. The relationship appears to be contingent upon one's attitudes.

The Work Environment

If interaction with friends and neighbors can affect a man's behavior, his on-the-job interactions may also be related to his behavior. Although on-the-job interactions have been shown to be unrelated to attitudes,[1] such interactions may serve as sources of information about the college entrance process. Table 59 presents data relevant to this point.

TABLE 59

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND ON THE JOB INTERACTIONS AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS	
	Interaction		Interaction	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=77)	Low (N=86)	High (N=72)	Low (N=98)
High	29%	44%	24%	29%
Low	71	56	76	71
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = -.32*		Q = -.10	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among fathers of girls the lack of relationship is not surprising, To discuss one's daughter in the work place may be viewed as unmasculine. Further, to discuss one's daughter with a white collar superordinate or peer may be presuming on the status and authority structures within the work environment. Exchange of information about college entrance would therefore seem unlikely to occur.

---

[1] Although the relationships were insignificant, they were suggestive of possible negative influences, similar to those shown in Table 59.

However, the negative relationship among fathers of boys is unexpected. Table 60, however, presents some additional data.

TABLE 60

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND ON THE JOB INTERACTION AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, CONTROLLING FOR FORMAL WORK AUTHORITY AS REPRESENTED BY FOREMANSHIP STATUS

	FOREMEN		NON-FOREMEN	
	Interaction		Interaction	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=11)	Low (N=21)	High (N=66)	Low (N=63)
High	72%	42%	21%	42%
Low	28	58	79	58
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q = .56*		Q = .46*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among foremen the positive relationship could be explained by the suggestion of access to information, where status allows him to approach white collar workers and his having a son provides a masculine topic of conversation. However, as was stated earlier, reported topics of conversation between blue collar and white collar workers only rarely included the educational plans of children. Perhaps the blue collar worker gains information by listening to white collar workers discuss children among themselves, or perhaps the blue collar worker is given unrequested information by an interested superordinate.

The strong negative relationship among non-foremen is perplexing. This pattern mitigates against my interpretation that supportive behavior is a function of access to information. Without further data only speculation is possible. The white collar workers with whom a blue collar worker is likely to interact are either one step above him in authority or perform low level white collar jobs. Thus, the blue collar worker may reason that an investment in education does not provide sufficient returns in terms of occupational status to justify the expense for his son. This conclusion must be regarded as highly tentative, based as it is on such gross measures and on cross-sectional data.

Hypothesis 4, that there is a positive relaionship between frequent contact with white collar work-mates and supportive behavior, receives ambiguous support. Therefore, no decision is made with reference to its acceptance.

A second element of the work environment is the demands made by the job. I have earlier spoken of the difference between the act performed and the authority with which it is performed. This latter aspect is indicated by whether or not the respondent is a foreman. It was argued that being a foreman would be related to supportive behavior. Table 61 presents evidence that this relationship obtains among fathers of boys but not among fathers of girls.

TABLE 61

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND FOREMANSHIP STATUS AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS	
Score on Admissions Index	Foremen (N=33)	Non-foremen (N=130)	Foremen (N=39)	Non-foremen (N=131)
High	51%	33%	33%	25%
Low	49%	67%	67%	75%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.36*		Q=.19	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

As will be shown later in this chapter, the relationship between foremanship status and supportive behavior is independent of other variables.

One possible explanation of the observed differential phenomenon among fathers of boys is that information is sought by fathers of boys but not by fathers of girls. If access to information is a reasonable explanation it may be affected by the respondent's own educational level. That is, among better educated blue collar workers there may be no need to seek information in the work place about the college-going process. But among less well educated blue collar workers the necessity to seek information would be felt. Less well educated men who are foremen would be in a better position than rank and file workers to tap white collar persons for information. Therefore we would expect a strong relationship between foremanship and supportive behavior among less well-educated workers, but not necessarily so among better educated workers. Table 62 provides some support for this interpretation.

TABLE 62

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND FOREMANSHIP STATUS AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, HOLDING EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT CONSTANT

	High School Graduate or More		Some High School or Less	
Score on Admissions Index	Foremen (N=18)	Non-foremen (N=68)	Foremen (N=16)	Non-foremen (N=61)
High	50%	48%	50%	18%
Low	50	52	50	82
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.04		Q=.64*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Further support would be provided for the interpretation if, among less well educated persons, the relationship between foremanship and supportive behavior were contingent on the respondent's desire for that information; in other words, his attitudes toward college-going. Table 63 presents the relevant data.

TABLE 63

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND FOREMANSHIP STATUS AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS WITHOUT A FULL HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION, HOLDING CONSTANT ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLEGE-GOING

	HIGH ATTITUDES		LOW ATTITUDES	
Score on Admissions Index	Foremen (N=12)	Non-foremen (N=23)	Foremen (N=4)	Non-foremen (N=38)
High	58%	26%	25%	13%
Low	42	74	75	87
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.59*		Q=.38	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

The interpretation is not contradicted by the data presented above.

However, there is at least one other explanation.[1]

---

[1] I am indebted to Professor Charles Bidwell of the University of Chicago for suggesting this interpretation.

That is, that the relationship of Table 62 demonstrates a status maintenance phenomenon where foremanship and more education symbolize higher status. Table 63 demonstrates that among poorly educated men with low attitudes, education is not seen as affecting the son's status. This interpretation is consonant with the fact that among fathers of girls, foremanship and supportive behavior was not related. Men tend not to project status aspirations onto their daughters.

The second element of activity-specific components of the work environment is what a man actually does. It was thought that his interaction with his occupational tasks would affect his attitudes but that it would not affect his behavior, if supportive behavior were dependent on his having access to information about how to behave. As Table 64 shows, there is a positive relationship between Job Content, the index of work activity, and supportive behavior among fathers of boys. However, this relationship does not persist if the respondent's own educational level is introduced as a control (Table 65). Among fathers of girls there is no significant zero order relationship (Table 64).

TABLE 64

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND JOB CONTENT AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS	
Score on Admissions	High (N=77)	Low (N=86)	High (N=74)	Low (N=96)
High	45%	29%	31%	23%
Low	55%	71%	69%	77%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.33*		Q=.20	

*Significantly Different from zero at 95% level.

TABLE 65

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND JOB CONTENT AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

	JOB CONTENT	
Score on Admissions Index	High (N=77)	Low (N=86)
High	44%	31%
Low	56	69
	100%	100%

Q=.25

Given the data about the activity-specific component of an occupation, no clear decision can be reached with respect to Hypothesis 5.

Among the negotiable components of an occupation, income level, security of position, and occupational prestige may indirectly affect supportive behavior. In the cases of income level and security of position the relationship may be one of prohibiting a respondent from long range planning. On the other hand, a high income or a secure position may induce a respondent to think about the future status of his children. As Table 66 shows, the relationship between income level and supportive behavior is contingent upon the sex of the child.

TABLE 66

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND INCOME LEVEL AMONG FATHERS OF:

	BOYS		GIRLS[1]	
	Income		Income	
Score on Admissions Index	$10,000 or more (N=78)	$10,000 or less (N=85)	$10,000 or more (N=97)	$10,000 or less (N=73)
High	51%	24%	24%	33%
Low	49	76	76	67
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.53*		Q=.22	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Among fathers of boys the strong positive relationship cannot be affected by controls such as the respondent's own education, the status of his friend or neighbor, his attitudes, or his status as a foreman. This will be shown when Coleman's effects model is presented. The question of the nature of the relationship between income and supportive behavior must go unanswered except for some tentative differences with respect to the respondent's educational level and his attitudes. Table 67 presents some interesting percentages.

---

[1] This figure is somewhat misleading. By spreading income in $1,000 intervals and computing Goodman's Gamma a figure of .0285 was obtained. Therefore the attempt to present comparable tables for boys and girls distorted the relationship among fathers of girls. The equivalent treatment among fathers of boys produced a Gamma of .4003, quite similar to the Q value.

TABLE 67

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS REPORTING HIGH SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG THOSE WHO HAVE SONS AND:

High education, high attitudes, high income	53%	(N=40)
High education, high attitudes, low income	47%	(N=21)
High education, low attitudes, high income	58%	(N=17)
Low education, high attitudes, high income	52%	(N=23)
High education, low attitudes, low income	12%	(N=8)
Low education, high attitudes, low income	8%	(N=12)
Low education, low attitudes, high income	22%	(N=22)
Low education, low attitudes, low income	5%	(N=19)

It appears that if a man has both a high education and positive attitudes toward college-going his relatively low income will not stop him from exhibiting a high degree of supportive behavior. On the other hand, a high income would seem to be a countervailing influence whenever either education or attitudes are low, but not when both are low. Finally, unless both education and attitudes are high, a relatively low income may depress supportive behavior, although in both these cases the number of respondents is very small.

The effects of security of position are not interesting. Among fathers of girls there is no relationship between the Career Index and supportive behavior (Q=.08). Among fathers of boys, the relationship is positive and significant (Q=.37), but can be reduced to insignificance (Q=.29) when the respondent's income is introduced as a control.

If the "access to information" hypothesis has any basis in reality, occupational prestige ought not show a relationship with supportive behavior. This is the case as Tables 68 and 69 demonstrate.

TABLE 68

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

	Prestige Score			
Score on Admissions Index	Above 70 (N=46)	60-69 (N=64)	50-59 (N=42)	40-49 (N=10)
High	39%	45%	31%	10%
Low	61	55	69	90
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma=.1312

Among those with the lowest prestige scores supportive behavior would seem almost impossible, but among the other groups there are no significant differences.

TABLE 69

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

	Prestige Score				
Score on Admissions Index	Above 70 (N=33)	60-69 (N=76)	50-59 (N=22)	40-49 (N=6)	30-39 (N=3)
High	30%	33%	36%	50%	33%
Low	70	67	64	50	67
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Gamma=-.1101

The relationship among fathers of girls has an interesting curvilinear form but cases in the lower prestige groups are too few to allow much else to be said. If the form of the relationship were truly curved I would speculate that the family's own frustrated aspirations are transferred to the daughter. Whether it is the father who wants to give his daughter more status than he has been able to give his wife, or whether it is the mother who wants more for her daughter than she has had herself is a moot point.

As has been the situation before in this study, no clear decision can be made with respect to an hypothesis. Hypothesis 6, then, must go unresolved in terms of the behavioral component of parental support for a college education.

In an attempt to make the relationships between the various independent variables and supportive behavior more explicit, Coleman's technique of effects was employed. The tables for relationships within the group of fathers of girls are presented first. The variables chosen for inclusion were the respondent's educational level, the statuses of his friend and his neighbor, and his attitudes. The first three were previously shown to be independently related to supportive behavior, while attitudes were not related. Attitudes were included to demonstrate that the technique does point up insignificant relationships as well as significant ones. Table 70 presents the proportion of men in each category who had reported a high degree of supportive behavior.

TABLE 70

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND FOUR SELECTED VARIABLES AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS

Low Attitudes								High Attitudes							
Low Friend				High Friend				Low Friend				High Friend			
Low Neighbor		High Neighbor		Low Neighbor		High Neighbor		Low Neighbor		High Neighbor		Low Neighbor		High Neighbor	
Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education	Low Education	High Education
(12)	(10)	(9)	(6)	(14)	(6)	(10)	(9)	(19)	(10)	(6)	(8)	(8)	(11)	(16)	(16)
.08	.50	.11	.16	.14	.16	.30	.44	.10	.10	.50	.25	.25	.36	.37	.50

TABLE 71

WEIGHTED EFFECTS ON SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG FATHERS OF GIRLS OF RESPONDENT ATTRIBUTES

a_1 = Effect of education $= .0829$ $P\{A_1 \leq 0\} = < .0001$

a_2 = Effect of neighbor's status $= .1175$ $P\{A_2 \leq 0\} = < .0001$

a_3 = Effect of friend's status $= .1053$ $P\{A_3 \leq 0\} = < .0001$

a_4 = Effect of attitudes toward college $= .0404$ $P\{A_4 \leq 0\} = < .025$

Among fathers of boys, two tables had to be constructed in order to show the effects of the selected variables. The limited number of cases prohibited the computation of effects for more than four variables at a time. As it is, the effect of foremanship cannot be satisfactorily weighted due to the lack of any positive cases in some cells. This phenomenon makes the calculation of cell variance highly doubtful. Further, the unweighted effects cannot be tested for significance for the same reason (Table 75).

TABLE 72

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND FOUR SELECTED VARIABLES AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

Low Income								High Income							
Low Education				High Education				Low Education				High Education			
Low Neighbor		High Neighbor		Low Neighbor		High Neighbor		Low Neighbor		High Neighbor		Low Neighbor		High Neighbor	
Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend	Low Friend	High Friend
(15)	(7)	(3)	(7)	(7)	(5)	(3)	(14)	(18)	(9)	(7)	(11)	(9)	(13)	(7)	(28)
.06	.14	.33	.14	.14	.40	.00	.57	.33	.33	.29	.54	.33	.53	.42	.64

TABLE 73

WEIGHTED EFFECTS ON SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS OF RESPONDENT ATTRIBUTES

a_1 = Effect of friend's status =.2357 $P\{A_1 \leq 0\} < .0001$

a_2 = Effect of neighbor's status =.0667 $P\{A_2 \leq 0\} < .002$

a_3 = Effect of education =.1256 $P\{A_3 \leq 0\} < .0001$

a_4 = Effect of income =.2300 $P\{A_4 \leq 0\} < .0001$

TABLE 74

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND FOUR SELECTED VARIABLES AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS

Low Income								High Income							
Low Education				High Education				Low Education				High Education			
Non-Foremen		Foremen		Non-Foremen		Foremen		Non-Foremen		Foremen		Non-Foremen		Foremen	
Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes	Low Attitudes	High Attitudes
(20)	(11)	(0)	(1)	(7)	(17)	(1)	(4)	(18)	(12)	(4)	(11)	(14)	(30)	(3)	(10)
.05	.09	.00	.00	.14	.52	.00	.25	.22	.41	.25	.63	.50	.53	1.00	.50

TABLE 75

UNWEIGHTED EFFECTS ON SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AMONG FATHERS OF BOYS OF RESPONDENT ATTRIBUTES

a_1 = Effect of attitudes toward college =.0987

a_2 = Effect of foremanship =.0250

a_3 = Effect of education =.2237

a_4 = Effect of income =.3737

The Environment of Voluntary Non-work Organizations

It was argued in Chapter I that membership in "model expansive" organizations would be associated with attitudes and supportive behavior. Although such membership was not related to attitudes it may be related to supportive behavior. The mechanism predicted to operate was that of providing the blue collar worker with a set of possible interactions with persons possessing information about college-going. If he chose to use these sources of information a relationship between his membership and his behavior will be demonstrable. As Table 76 indicates, membership in "model expansive" organizations is independently related to supportive behavior, even when other powerful variables are used as controls.

TABLE 76[1]

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP, STANDARDIZED ON EDUCATION OF RESPONDENT, AND THE STATUSES OF HIS FRIEND AND HIS NEIGHBOR

	ZERO ORDER		STANDARDIZED	
Score on Admissions Index	Organization Membership		Organization Membership	
	Expansive (N=177)	Restrictive (N=156)	Expansive	Restrictive
High	40%	22%	39%	24%
Low	60	78	61	76
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.41*		Q=.34*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

By controlling for attitudes, support available for the predicted relationship can be assessed (Table 77).

TABLE 77

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP, HOLDING CONSTANT ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENT

	HIGH ATTITUDES		LOW ATTITUDES	
Score on Admissions Index	Organization Membership		Organization Membership	
	Expansive (N=108)	Restrictive (N=82)	Expansive (N=69)	Restrictive (N=74)
High	46%	26%	30%	16%
Low	54	74	70	84
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.40*		Q=.39*	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

---

[1] The fathers of boys and of girls were analyzed separately. No significant differences were found.

Attitudes about the value of going to college seemingly have no effect on the relationship between organizational membership and supportive behavior. However, as has been shown, organizational membership and attitudes are somewhat related and attitudes and behavior are related. A tentative conclusion is suggested to the effect that those variables which are related to attitudes also cause a man to become active in "model expansive" organizations. This explanation receives no support when the data are examined. For example, the relationship between educational level and organizational membership is positive but insignificant.

But the status of a neighbor is related to the type of membership. Therefore, among respondents with high status neighbors the relationship between membership and supportive behavior should be stronger than for respondents with a low status neighbor. Table 78 shows these data.

TABLE 78

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP, HOLDING CONSTANT THE STATUS OF THE NEIGHBOR

	HIGH STATUS NEIGHBOR		LOW STATUS NEIGHBOR	
Score on Admissions Index	Organizational Membership		Organizational Membership	
	Expansive (N=98)	Restrictive (N=63)	Expansive (N=79)	Restrictive (N=93)
High	50%	27%	28%	19%
Low	50	73	72	81
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Q=.46*		Q=.25	

*Significantly different from zero at 95% level.

Some support for the explanation that the observed relationship between organizational membership and supportive behavior is spurious is found, both being dependent on having a high status neighbor. At least two interpretations of this finding are possible. The first is that a blue collar worker who feels a discrepancy between his status and that of his neighbor will join model expansive organizations as a means of raising his perceived status. He will exhibit, for the same reason, supportive behavior toward his child's entrance into college.

The second interpretation is that his higher status neighbor will recruit him into model expansive organizations. In this case the source of college information is the neighbor and not the organization *per se*. This is partly demonstrated by the low percentage of men belonging to model expansive organizations but having a low status neighbor who report a high degree of supportive behavior.

On the basis of the analysis presented, Hypothesis 7, that there is an independent relationship between organizational membership and supportive behavior, can be rejected. The corollary to Hypothesis 7 can be accepted.

Summary

In general, there were found to be relationships between supportive behavior and more independent variables among fathers of boys than among fathers of girls. This finding suggests the possibility that fathers evidence supportive behavior with respect to their daughters for different reasons than for their sons. Some evidence was presented to indicate that these reasons derived from pressures brought to bear by the wife. However, among fathers of boys and girls the "access to information" suggestion was, in general, not contradicted by the evidence presented. Relationships which might indicate such a phenomenon were found to be positive and relationships which would contradict such an interpretation were found to be statistically insignificant.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The research reported in this study has dealt with two cells of a classic four-cell contingency table which shows the relationship between the occupations of fathers and their childrens' intentions to go to college. Research consistently demonstrates that children of white collar workers are more likely to attend college than children of blue collar workers. More sophisticated research has expanded the applicability of the observation, indicating that the relationship holds regardless of the child's native ability, his achievement in high school, his place of residence within a rural-urban context, and the quality of the high school he attends. Further, we know that the difference in college attendance rates persists when parental and peer-group expectations for the child's college attendance are held constant. But given the complexities of human existence, there are always children of blue collar workers who do intend to enter college. On the assumption that the parents of these children acquiese to, if they do not support, the child's entrance, I have tried to understand the mechanisms which differentiate them from the blue collar workers whose children do not plan to enter college.

For two reasons the population studied in this research has consisted of blue collar fathers rather than their children. First, while it is the child who ultimately enters college, it is not he alone who has been involved in the pre-college planning. In fact, Joiner[1] has argued that parental expectations constitute a major force in the child's eventual behavior with respect to college entrance. Thus it is not unreasonable to assume that the parents and the child together constitute some kind of decision-making group concerned with the child's ultimate educational goals. Other forces such as the child himself, his friends and his school enter the decision process, but the parents constitute a contributing factor worthy of consideration. This is not to imply that we can perdict the child's behavior from parental desires and behavior. It is argued, though, that an understanding of the factors which influence parental behavior and attitudes contributes to our understanding of the child's progress toward college entrance. Heretofore in reported research the relationships between any set of variables and a decision to enter college have accounted for less than 50% of the statistical variance in the child's decision. Therefore, a great deal is left unexplained. While the research reported here does not directly contribute to our understanding of the child's behavior, it does underscore the fact that parental attitudes and behavior with reference to college-going have underpinnings of some demonstrable regularity. It is hoped that these in turn are related to the child's behavior.

The second reason for examining parental attributes is that social stratification research is now amenable to more detailed analysis. The gross parameters of class-based behavior are fairly well defined. We are increasingly less hesitant to assume that educational level, occupational role and income level combine in some fashion to delimit life chances.

---

[1] Lee M. Joiner, et.al., "Student Definitions of the Educational Expectations of Others and the Development of Educational Plans: A Longitudinal Study of High School Males," a paper read at the American Educational Research Association meeting, February 18, 1966, at Chicago, Illinois.

In Weber's terms, a collectivity which shares equally "a specific causal component of their life chances,"[1] may be spoken of as a class. Life chances are derived from a market situation in which goods and opportunities for income are unequally distributed. A class has potential for collective action, but collective action need not arise from a given class. "The class situation may be restricted in its effects to the generation of essentially "similar" (Author's italics) reactions, that is to say, within our terminology, of 'mass actions.' However, it may not have even this result."[2]

Therefore, our assumptions that education, income and occupational role delimit life chances do not provide a theoretically sufficient basis for examining the mechanism by which a potentially active collectivity does or does not act. Weber's distinction between class and status is somewhat more useful in this regard. He speaks of status groups as being normally communities in which the actions of members of the status group are circumscribed by group norms. The basis of a "status situation /is/ every typical component of the life fate of men that is determined by a specific, positive or negative, social estimation of "honor" (Author's italics)."[3] Implicit in the designation of a status group is the necessity for its members to interact with one another in intimate face to face intercourse. Status groups can be identified by their distinct life styles, or in other words, by their patterns of consumption of goods and services. Status groups are more indicative of the social order in the United States than are class situations. As Weber said, "when the bases of acquisition and distribution of goods are relatively stable, stratification by status is favored."[1] We can observe in every geographical area in the United States collectivities which are recognized as status groups. However, Weber's typology does not allow us to explain why status groups isolated from one another by distance, or other boundaries, will exhibit similar consumption patterns. While individuals within a particular status group behave in a similar fashion, what accounts for the similarity in behavior among comparable status groups? How is it that consumption patterns are virtually duplicated from one status group to another occupying a comparable place in the stratification order?

---

[1] Max Weber, "Class Status, Party," in Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, translated by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946) p. 180.

[2] Ibid., p. 183.

[3] Ibid., p. 187.

Inkeles has said, "within broad limits, the same situational pressures, the same framework for living, will be experienced as similar and will generate the same or similar response by persons from different countries."[2] Although his focus is international, the mechanism applies also to persons within the same national boundaries. This paper has been based, then, on the assumption that persons with similar frameworks for living, or similar life circumstances, will respond to comparable stimuli in analogous ways. Persons with similar life circumstances may or may not form status groups depending on their access to each other and their mutual access to still other persons with similar life circumstances. Within broad limits, these persons constitute a social class, although their individual means of securing economic power may be different; such as, a blue collar worker and a lower level white collar worker.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 192.

[2] Inkeles, op. cit., p. 2.

To define similar life circumstances is an increasingly complex task in the United States. In the main, definitions based on educational level, and a blue collar-white collar occupational distinction have been useful for explaining gross behavior patterns. In contemporary social research, techniques are available for further detailing the definition of "similar life circumstances." I have shown that two blue collar workers, with essentially equal occupational prestige and income, do not enjoy similar life circumstances. One has graduated from high school, has a "high" status friend, a "high" status neighbor, is a foreman, and performs relatively intellectual work tasks. The other has none of these attributes. The obvious question is: To what extent do these men enjoy similar life circumstances? I have explored other viable dimensions of the definition of such circumstances. This added complexity is, I believe, valuable for understanding the whole, intriciate system of social differentiation.

It has been easy enough in the past to predict behavior pattern differences between extremes in social class constructs. This probably is true today. But within what Curtiss[1] has termed the "middle mass" social class differences, as traditionally defined, are becoming less obvious. What are the differences between a junior grade book-keeper, say, and a construction foreman? Both may be responsible for the computation and ordering of complex, numerical relationships. Both may be relatively well-paid. Both may have had some college education. Both may live in the same suburb. The foreman, however, may control the work flow of 50 men, while the book-keeper is responsible only for his own work. The foreman may report directly to a graduate engineer or the owner of a large construction enterprise. The book-keeper may report to a senior book-keeper whose desk is set apart from those of the junior book-keepers by its placement on a six inch high platform at one end of a room with 30 identical desks. Which worker is the more likely to want to send his child to college? Traditional stratification research would predict the book-keeper. But as work roles become more specialized, and in a sense less visible, the traditional variates perhaps become less useful predictors. One alternative, implicit in this research, is that the blue collar-white collar dichotomy is still useful, but that other dimensions of a life circumstance construct can be added. Thus, we can look at a man's friendship patterns, and the less visible components of his job, in order to better understand at least one type of behavior; support for college-going of his children.

---

[1] Richard Curtiss, "Differential Association and the Stratification of the Urban Community," op.cit.

The Findings

In this study I chose to investigate the effects of life circumstances, defined with reference to four environments, on support for college-going. The four environments which defined life circumstances were: the environment of a man's social background, that is, his education, his father's occupation and his wife's education; the environment of a man's friendship patterns; the work environment; and, the environment of his voluntary membership in non-work organizations. It was proposed that experiences within these environments would affect a man's decision with respect to his child's attendance at college. As Figure 7 demonstrates, the broad hypothesis can be accepted. Attitudes toward college-going and subsequent supportive behavior are related to elements of each of the four environments, excepting the environment of non-work organizations. This exception was interpreted as a consequence of a recruitment effect in which membership in a non-work organization derives from a friend or a neighbor.

In general, the influences on attitudes are somewhat different from those on behavior, and are dependent on the sex of the respondent's child. Attitudes appear to be related to fewer, and perhaps more personal variates, than is behavior. The father of a boy seems to be influenced by a greater number and a different type of variate than the father of a girl. The latter phenomenon was interpreted as an indication that the mother perhaps played the key role in a college decision involving a daughter. Further, the variates in the work environment which are related to attitudes for fathers of boys are

FIGURE 7

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS CLASSIFIED BY SEX OF CHILD AND DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Attitudes		Behavior	
Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Education		Attitudes	
Status of Friend	Status of Friend [a]	Education	Education
Status of Neighbor	Status of Neighbor [a]	Education of wife	Occupation of respondent's father
Foremanship	Occupation of respondent's father	Occupation of respondent's father	Status of Friend
Job Content	Job security	Status of Friend	Status of Neighbor
Occupational Prestige	Job Content	Status of Neighbor	
	Income	Foremanship	
		On-Job-Interaction	
		Income	

[a] These relationships are weak, but in the posited direction.

indicators of the visible, prestige elements of an occupation. The work environment variates which are related to attitudes for fathers of girls are indicators of the less visibly prestige-related elements of an occupation. This finding is reasonable in view of the differential role of college attendance for boys and girls. Boys represent to the outside world some part of the family's social status. If a son is successful, the family receives reflected status. The most obvious measure of a son's success is his occupational role. Although a daughter may cast shame or honor on her family, the means to do so are less obvious. Her attendance at college may only indirectly affect her chance for success.

There is also the possibility that a blue collar worker whose occupational prestige is visibly higher than that of other blue collar workers (for instance, a foreman) may experience pressure to behave according to perceived expectations. That is, there may be no overt pressure to have positive attitudes about college for his son, but he may believe that his better position demands that he manifest his higher social stature by demonstrating his ability to prepare his son for an even higher occupational role.

Supportive behavior, I have argued is based on ability to participate in the decision-making process. As Hyman has said, "Achievement in any realm is dependent on two factors; the possession of both the necessary ability and the motivation to reach the goal. Ability is of course limited by "socially imposed" (Author's italics) barriers to training and lack of channels to given types of positions."[1] In the context of my argument, supportive behavior was shown to be related to motivation (attitudes toward college-going) and to ability (access to information).

In so far as the steps required to gain admission to college are not universally known, a family may need to seek advice and information concerning its expected behavior. Certainly the child represents one information source, but I have shown that other sources may also be available. The most interesting sources of information and influence are a man's friends and his neighbors. His friend and his neighbor are influences seemingly, only if he allows them to be. Thus, only if he has graduated from high school are his attitudes about college related to his having a high status friend or neighbor. Further, the relationship between the status of his neighbor and his attitudes is stronger if the neighbor is a long-time acquaintance.

As sources of information about expected supportive behavior, friends and neighbors are seemingly influential only if the respondent wants them to be. Thus, if his attitudes about college are positive the extent of his supportive behavior is related to the status of his friend and his neighbor. Further, if his attitudes are positive and both his friend and neighbor have high status he is more likely to exhibit supportive behavior then if just one of the two has high status. If his attitudes are not positive there is no relationship between supportive behavior and the status of friend or neighbor.

---

[1] Herbert Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification, in Richard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class, Status and Power (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1953), p. 429.

Implications

The role of a significant other in intepersonal relations has been intensively studied in the field and in social psychological laboratories. From the classic studies of Asch[1] to the studies in rural sociology of the diffusion of an agricultural innovation,[2] significant others have been shown to act as influence agents on a variety of decisions. Implicit in these studies has been the assumption that the outcome of the decision is important to both parties in the influence exchange. Thus, in the social psychological laboratory there is always presented some task to which is attached a system of rewards and punishments. In the diffusion of an innovation, it is presumed that a reward structure is inherently attached to the adoption of the innovation studied. The innovation ostensibly will increase the productive output of the adopter. However, Riesman[3] has shown that in certain types of interaction, sociable interaction, sociability is the prime force behind the interaction. In such interactions each person may forego the imposition of his own beliefs if those beliefs are likely to decrease sociability. Similarly, in a friend to friend or neighbor to neighbor interaction, certain belief systems may be withheld from the exchange in order to preserve the interaction. Thus, persons resolve not to discuss politics or religion when visiting each other's homes. Among the blue collar workers of this study the influence exerted by a high status friend or neighbor appears to be conditioned by a desire to accept the potential influence. If we can assume equal degrees of friendliness or intimacy with neighbors among all members of the sample, then the relationships which obtain would seem to indicate that the value of college can be excluded from the shared belief system generally thought to be necessary for the maintenance of friendship. As I shall show later this line of argument has implications for further research.

---

[1] Soloman Asch, "Effects of Group Pressures upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," Groups Leadership and Men, edited by Harold Guetzkow (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951).

[2] Bruce Ryan and Neil Gross, "The Diffusion of Hybrid Seed Corn in Two Iowa Communities," Rural Sociology, XIII (September 1958) pp.273-85.

[3] David Riesman, Robert J. Potter, and Jeanne Watson, "Sociability, Permissiveness, and Equality," Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 23,4 (November 1960), pp. 323-340.

A second implication of the relationships between friend or neighbor status and attitudes and behavior involves the role of certain contextual effects. Campbell and Alexander[1] discovered that the structural effects of a predominant social class high school environment were functions of friendships within the high school. Thus, that a working class child who attends a middle class high school is more likely to enter college than one who attends a working class high school is a result of friendships and not of a general cultural milieu of the school. Working class children are simply more likely to have middle class friends in a predominantly middle class high school than in a working class high school.

Much the same phenomenon may occur among adults in a community.

---

[1] Ernest Q. Campbell and Norman C. Alexander, "Structural Effects and Interpersonal Relationships," American Journal of Sociology, 71 (November 1965), pp. 284-89.

If so, Bell's[1] finding concerning increased organizational activity among blue collar workers living in a "high" status neighborhood may be a function of neighborhood friendship patterns.[2] Sewell argues, though, that neighborhood context explains very little of the variance in a child's stated intention to enter college.[3] Controlling for sex, intelligence, and family social status, the social status of the neighborhood accounted for only an additional 2 percent of the variance. Closer inspection of his data, however, demonstrates findings which a multiple regression technique masked. In order to compare his findings with mine, certain liberties had to be taken with the definitions of the sub-groups which he investigated. In reanalysis of his data I have combined the middle and high intelligence groups, since my sample was restricted to fathers of students in the upper one-half of their respective high school classes. Few students scoring in the lower one-third of an intelligence test would be found in the upper one-half of an achievement-based class rank. Further, I combined his middle and low family social status groups on the assumption that my sample of blue collar workers would be similar to these groups as defined by Sewell. The results of reanalysis are interesting. Among boys who are of middle to high intelligence and who come from middle to low social status families, 53% plan to attend college if they also live in a high status neighborhood. Among boys with identical personal attributes but who live in a low status neighborhood, only 34% plan to enter college. Sewell's definition of a high status neighborhood is one which has more than 40% white collar workers, a neighborhood not unlike those in Bremen Township.

---

[1] Bell and Force, op. cit.

[2] My own finding of a recruitment effect lends support to such an interpretation.

[3] William H. Sewell and J. Michael Armer, "Neighborhood Context and College Plans," American Sociological Review, 31 (April 1966), pp. 159-168.

Among an analogous sub-group of girls, 48% of those in high status neighborhoods plan to enter college.

Within at least one sub-group, one which is superficially comparable to the sample of my study, neighborhood context seems to make a difference. But neighborhood context, I have argued, is not important except as a pool of available significant others with whom to interact. Within a low status neighborhood (less than 30% white collar by Sewell's definition) there are obviously fewer possible white collar neighbors of blue collar residents. Thus, my findings indirectly agree with Campbell's interpretation of the effect of friendship patterns on the college-going decision.

A third implication derived from the data of this study concerns theories of social stratification. Page has drawn the distinction between class as a socioeconomic aggregate "whose distinction is rooted in the economic cleavages of a community," and class as a sociopsychological phenomenon reflected in social attitudes.[1] While these two elements of the definition of a social class are not mutually exclusive, they do represent different foci of a stratification theory. We are reminded of Weber's distinction between classes and status groups. However, as Hamilton argues,[1] a focus on "style of life" as "the bought artifacts, has obscured the fact of persisting or shifting value cleavages." For my study, "style of life" seems not relevant as a distinguisher among blue collar and white collar workers, except as the concept becomes redefined from an exclusive use of outward symbols, to an inclusion of patterns of interpersonal association. Or in Weber's original terms, status groups, even though the group may be only a dyad.

---

[1] Charles H. Page, "Social Class and American Sociology," in Bendix and Lipset, Class, Status and Power, op. cit., pp. 45-48.

Toward Further Research

By demonstrating that a shared belief system need not include beliefs about the value of college attendance I have, I think, underscored the necessity for further research into the boundaries of status groups. In American society many of the outward symbols of a higher social class are available to members of lower social classes. In Weber's terms even the definition of social classes has undergone some modification. Ownership of the means of production is increasingly rare with the advent of publicly owned corporations. Power to sell skills in the market place is increasingly protected by such institutions as labor unions. Dahrendorf[2] speaks of control over the means of production, represented by a bureaucratic elite, as the major class distinction. The junior grade bookkeeper and the construction foreman seem to have comparable control over the means of production. Thus, for Dahrendorf they are members of the same social class. I believe that I have shown enough variation in attitudes and behavior among blue collar workers to seriously question the usefulness of social class as a concept. However, the definition of status groups has become somewhat fuzzy. Patterns of consumption are becoming less distinguishable, but differentiation according to some criteria persist. I suggest that the continued research into attempts to define the boundaries of status groups by reference to their shared beliefs will be fruitful. That is, what beliefs are unique to and sacrosanct to what status groups? Among the elite, however defined, of the United States is there a cluster of values which if not subscribed to precludes membership? Likewise, among the lower class, is there a set of beliefs which is unique and coercive? Certainly a great deal of previous research has described differential belief systems of various social classes. But it has not been argued that these belief systems define the practical boundaries of the classes. A sociopsychological interpretation of the stratification system must cut across lines of economic distinction to be useful. I would argue that there may exist certain basic beliefs shared only by comparable status groups, which beliefs account for differential social behavior.

---

[1] Richard F. Hamilton, "The Marginal Middle Class: A Reconsideration" American Sociological Review, 31 (April 1966), p. 199.

[2] Ralf Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society(Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959).

A second avenue of research concerns the role of suburban residence on the attitudes and behavior of blue collar workers. The suburban blue collar worker may or may not place more value on education than his city brothers. I have shown that not all suburban blue collar workers value college. If the important variates are other than suburban residence per se, a comparative study of suburban and city blue collar workers should produce results similar to those reported here. Blue collar workers who live in a predominantly blue collar neighborhood will be isolated from white collar neighbors. Even though they may desire college for their children their supportive behavior will be limited. If they have limited access to sources of information we would expect them to display less positive supportive behavior than blue collar workers who have greater access to information. Thus, residence location is not important except as the blue collar worker is or is not exposed to white collar neighbors.

Implications for Education

The implications of this research for school administrators are varied. The first implication is the suggestion that a family's participation in a child's decision to enter college is contingent on the family's ability to participate. College-going is becoming a complex process in which a greater number of alternative post-high school experiences are presented a child. In a mobile society the child is less restricted in the geographical location of his intended college. In a complex society with an increasing specialization of labor, colleges are also becoming more specialized institutions. The results of attending College X may be quite different from those obtained from attending College Y, in terms of eventual occupation and social status. This is not to overstate the effects of attending a particular college, but to suggest that different types of colleges tend to produce graduates with dissimilar chances for eventual success. Among this sample of blue collar workers, the level of sophistication of the parents with respect to the decision to attend college is not high. However, it is higher among some than among others. I have tried to show that access to information is a crucial variable in a family's involvement. If the social structure isolates them from informal sources of information, and if a college education is thought to represent a general social good, some formal structure must be devised to provide the necessary information. Among already existing institutions the public school would seem to represent the logical structure through which this can be done.

The school's advice to the child and his family must be delicate. On the one hand it cannot assume that all children of suburban blue collar workers need or desire college. To do so would imply that the father's occupation was somehow a second class work role, unfitting for graduates of a suburban high school. On the other hand, the school cannot assume that children of blue collar workers are destined to be blue collar workers in turn. I have shown that some blue collar workers desire and work for a college education for their children with perhaps as much intensity as any white collar worker. As college-going continues to become an American expectation, schools must be prepared to understand the limitations of a family's ability to participate in the decisions of the children. They must further understand the limits beyond which they cannot go in encouraging college attendance among children of blue collar workers.

Although a decision to enter college is a complex one, there may be regularities which govern the process. This research has indicated the nature of some of these regularities.

APPENDIX A

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

ENTER TIME
INTERVIEW ________ AM
BEGAN: PM

Survey 867
October 1965

____
(1-3)

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

ASK TO SPEAK TO PERSON WHOSE NAME APPEARS ON THE FACE SHEET

Hello. I'm (your name) from the National Opinion Research Center. I believe you received a letter recently, explaining that we would like to interview you in connection with a study of the opinions of suburbanites about the areas in which they live, about their jobs, about schools in their areas, and about colleges in general. First . . .

1. How long have you lived here in (name of community)?

________ Years ________ Months 20/y

---

2. Where did you live just before you moved to (name of community)?

IF "CHICAGO," ASK: Where did you live in Chicago? (In what neighborhood?) (IF RESPONDENT DOESN'T KNOW NAME OF NEIGHBORHOOD, ASK FOR CLOSEST STREET INTERSECTION TO FORMER ADDRESS.)

21-22/yy

---

3. How long did you live there?

________ Years ________ Months 23/y

---

4. What were some of your reasons for moving to (name of community)? (PROBE: Any other reasons?)

24-25/yy

5. What kinds of jobs do most men in this neighborhood have?

26/

6. What social class would you say most of the people in this neighborhood belong to? (PROBE: Could you tell me what social class that is?) DO NOT USE THE TERMS "MIDDLE CLASS" OR "WORKING CLASS" IN YOUR PROBE.

27/y

7. Do you belong to any organizations, such as church groups, fraternal groups, bowling teams, political clubs, labor unions, etc.?

Yes . . (ASK A-E) . . . 1 28/y
No . (GO TO Q. 8) . . 2

IF YES: A. Which organizations are they? LIST IN COLUMN A BELOW. (PROBE: Any others?)

IF ONLY ONE ORGANIZATION MENTIONED, CODE IN "MOST ACTIVE" COLUMN OF "B" BELOW, WITHOUT ASKING B; THEN ASK C-E ABOUT THAT ORGANIZATION.

IF TWO ORGANIZATIONS MENTIONED, ASK B-E ABOUT THOSE TWO.

IF MORE THAN TWO ORGANIZATIONS LISTED, ASK B; THEN ASK C-E ABOUT ONLY THE TWO CODED IN "B."

B. Which one of the organizations you've mentioned are you most active in? CODE IN "MOST ACTIVE" COLUMN OF "B" BELOW.

And which of the organizations are you next most active in? CODE IN "SECOND MOST" COLUMN OF "B" BELOW.

C. Do you go to meetings of that group almost every week, about once a month, or less often than that? CODE IN COLUMN C BELOW.

D. Have you been elected to an office or have you served on a committee of (organization) in the past two years? CODE IN COLUMN D BELOW.

E. Are almost all, about half, or only a few of the members of (organization) from this community? CODE IN COLUMN E BELOW.

A.	B.		C.			D.		E.		
Name of Organization	Most Active	2nd Most Active	Almost Every Week	About Once a Month	Less Often	Yes	No	Almost All	About Half	Few
____________	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3
____________	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3
____________	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3
____________	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3
____________	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

(29)	30/y	31/y	32/y	33/y
(34)	35/y	36/y	37/y	38/y

8. HAND RESPONDENT BLUE CARD. Which of these social classes listed on this card would you say you belong to?

Lower class 1 39/y
Working class 2
Middle class 3
Upper class 4
Don't know 5

I have a few questions about the man you have the most contact with here in the neighborhood.

9. What is his occupation?

OCCUPATION: ________________________________ (40-42)

INDUSTRY: ________________________________ (43-45)

---

10. About how many times a week do you talk with him--more than just to say hello?

____________ 46/y
(Number of times)

---

11. As far as you know, what was the highest grade in school he completed?

No formal schooling 1 47/y
Eight years or less 2
Some high school 3
High school graduate 4
Some college 5
College graduate 6
Graduate or professional school . . . 7
Don't know 8

---

12. Does he have any children?

Yes . . . (ASK A) . . . 1 48/y
No . . (GO TO Q. 13) . 2

IF YES: A. Are any of his children in college now?

Yes . . (GO TO Q. 13) . 1 49/y
No . . . (ASK B) . . . 2

IF NO TO A: B. Is he, as far as you know, definitely planning to send any of them to college?

Yes 1 50/y
No 2

BEGIN DECK 2

Now, I'd like to talk to you a little about your job. ______ (1-3)

13. What is your occupation?

OCCUPATION: ________________________________ (6-8)

INDUSTRY: ________________________________ (9-11)

---

14. Do you have a formal job title?

Yes . . . (ASK A) 1 12/y
No . . (GO TO Q. 15) . . . 2

IF YES: A. What is it? 13/y

---

15. How long have you been a (Answer to Q. 13)?

Less than 2 years . . . (GO TO Q. 16) 1 14/y
3-5 years . . . . (GO TO Q. 16) 2
6-10 years . . . . (SKIP TO Q. 18) . . . 3
11-15 years . . . . (SKIP TO Q. 18) . . . 4
16-20 years . . . . (SKIP TO Q. 18) . . . 5
More than 20 years . . . (SKIP TO Q. 18) . . . 6

---

16. What sort of work did you do before your present job?

(15-17)

(18-20)

---

17. How long were you a (Answer to Q. 16)?

Less than 2 years 1 21/y
3 - 5 years 2
6 -10 years 3
11-15 years 4
16-20 years 5
More than 20 years. 6

---

18. How long have you held the exact job you now hold--same job, same company?

_______ years _______ months 22/y

---

19. How long have you been with your present company?

_______ years* _______ months 23/y

*IF MORE THAN 5 YEARS, SKIP TO Q. 21.

20. How long were you with the firm just before this one?

________ years ________ months 24/y

---

21. Considering the job you now have--what would you say are your chances for advancement--good, fair, or poor?

Good 1 25/y
Fair 2
Poor 3

---

22. Would you say your job is very secure, fairly secure, or not too secure?

Very secure 1 26/y
Fairly secure 2
Not too secure 3

---

23. What if your job were phased out, would you say your chances of getting as good a job within the company are very good, fairly good, or not too good?

Very good 1 27/y
Fairly good 2
Not too good 3

---

24. How about if you lost your job or left this company, do you think your chances of getting a similar job with another company are very good, fairly good, or not too good?

Very good 1 28/y
Fairly good 2
Not too good 3

---

25. How interesting is your job--would you say it's very interesting, fairly interesting, or not too interesting?

Very interesting 1 29/y
Fairly interesting 2
Not too interesting 3

---

26. How much freedom do you have about how you do your job, that is, how you organize your work--a great deal, some or not too much?

A great deal 1 30/y
Some 2
Not too much 3

27. Does your job ever require you to read things like blueprints or shop manuals?

Yes . . . . (ASK A) . . .	1	31/y
No . . . . (GO TO Q.28).	2	

IF YES: A. How often? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES, BUT CIRCLE CODE FOR ANSWER.

Every day	1	32/y
More than once a week	2	
Once a week	3	
Less often than that	4	

---

28. Does your job ever require you to use mathematics in any way?

Yes . . . . (ASK A) . . .	1	33/y
No . . . . (GO TO Q. 29)	2	

IF YES: A. How often?

Every day	1	34/y
Once a week or more	2	
Less than once a week	3	

---

29. Do you think you'll have to learn any new skills in the next ten years to be able to keep the same level job you now have?

Yes . . . .(ASK A). . . .	1	35/y
No . . . .(GO TO Q.30) .	2	
Don't know . . .(GO TO Q.30) .	3	

IF YES: A. Do you think you'll have to start learning these new skills within the next few weeks, this year, in the next five years, or later than that?

Within the next few weeks . .	1	36/y
This year	2	
In the next five years	3	
Later than that	4	

---

30. If a man were being hired now for a job just like yours, how many years of formal schooling would the company say he had to have? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES BUT CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

Completed elementary school .	1	37-38/yy
Some high school	2	
Completed high school	3	
Trade school	4	
Apprenticeship	5	
Some college	6	
Completed college	7	
Formal on-the-job training . .	8	
Other (SPECIFY)______________ ______________________	9	

31. How many years of formal schooling do you think a man should have to do your job?

Completed elementary school	1	39-40/yy
Some high school	2	
Completed high school	3	
Trade school	4	
Apprenticeship	5	
Some college	6	
Completed college	7	
Formal on-the-job training	8	
Other (SPECIFY)________________________ ____	9	

---

32. Would you be pleased if a son of yours someday had the same job you have?

Yes . .(GO TO Q. 33). . . .	1	41/y
No . . .(ASK A).	2	

IF NO: A. What kind of job would you like a son of yours to have?

42/y

Now, back to your job . . . .

33. Do you ever talk with your immediate superior about things not connected with the job?

Yes . .(ASK A&B).	1	43/y
No . . .(GO TO Q. 34) . . .	2	

IF YES: A. How often--almost every day, about once a week, or less often than that?

Almost every day	1	44/y
About once a week	2	
Less often than that	3	

B. What do you usually talk about?

45/y

---

34. What is (his) (your immediate superior's) job title?

(46-48)

(49-51)

35. Do you ever have occasion to talk with engineers, accountants, or management people on your job?

Yes . . . .(ASK A-C). 1 52/y
No . . . . .(GO TO Q. 36). . . 2

IF YES: A. How often--almost every day, about once a week, or less often than that?

Almost every day 1 53/y
About once a week 2
Less often than that 3

B. What do you usually talk about, other than job matters?

54/y

C. Would you say (he is a/they are) personal friend(s) of yours?

Yes 1 55/y
No 2

---

36. Do you supervise anyone on your job--that is, does anyone report to you directly?

Yes . . . . .(ASK A). 1 56/y
No . . . . . .(GO TO Q. 37). . 2

IF YES: A. How many people report to you? ________ 57/y

---

37. Think of the man you have most contact with on the job. What is his job title?

(58-60)

(61-63)

---

38. Is he your closest friend at work?

Yes . . . . .(GO TO Q. 39). . 1 64/y
No . . . . . .(ASK A). 2

IF NO: A. What is the job title of your closest friend at work?

(65-67)

(68-70)

---

39. Is he one of your two closest friends including those off the job?

Yes 1 71/y
No 2

---

40. Next, I'd like to ask you a few questions about the two men who are your closest friends.

A. It will help me to record the information if you'll tell me their first names. RECORD FIRST NAMES BELOW.

Friend One	Friend Two
________________________	________________________

BEGIN DECK 3

______
(1-3)

Q. 40--(Continued)

B. I've already asked you some questions about the man in the neighborhood with whom you have the most contact and also about the man at work with whom you have the most contact. Is (Friend 1) one of those two people we've already talked about?

FOLLOW SKIP INSTRUCTIONS AT RIGHT FOR Q's 41-47	Yes, neighborhood (ASK Q's 41 & 45 ONLY). . . .	1	6/y
	Yes, work . . . . (ASK Q's 41, 42, 46, 47 ONLY)	2	
	Yes, both . . . . (ASK Q. 41 ONLY).	3	
	No, neither . . . (ASK Q's 41-47)	4	

---

41. How long have you known (Friend 1)? ______Years ______Months 7/y

---

42. In what town does he live? 8/y

---

43. How many times a month do you see him? _____ times 9/y

---

44. What is his occupation?

OCCUPATION: ______________________ (10-12)

INDUSTRY: ______________________ (13-15)

---

45. Does he work for the same company that you do?

Yes	1	16/y
No	2	

---

46. As far as you know what was the highest grade in school he completed?

No formal schooling	1	17/y
8 years or less	2	
Some high school	3	
High school graduate	4	
Some college	5	
College graduate	6	
Graduate or professional school.	7	
Don't know	8	

---

47. Does he have any children?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	1	18/y
No . . . . (GO TO Q.48).	2	

IF YES: A. Are any of his children in college now?

Yes . . . (ASK B)	1	19/y
No . . . . (ASK C)	2	
Don't know (ASK C)	3	

IF YES TO A: B. What college? 20/y

IF NO OR "DK" TO A: C. Is he definitely planning to send any of his children to college?

Yes	1	21/y
No	2	
Don't know . . .	3	

Now, how about (Friend 2)--is he either the man you have the most contact with in the neighborhood or the man you have the most contact with at work (that we've already talked about)?

Yes, neighborhood (ASK Q's 48 & 52 ONLY) 1 22/y
Yes, work (ASK Q's 48, 49, 53, 54 ONLY). 2
Yes, both (ASK Q. 48 ONLY) 3
No, neither (ASK Q's 48 - 54) 4

---

48. How long have you known (Friend 2)? __________Years ________Months 23/y

---

49. In what town does he live? 24/y

---

50. How many times a month do you see him? ________ times 25/y

---

51. What is his occupation?

OCCUPATION: ________________________________ (26-28)
INDUSTRY: ________________________________ (29-31)

---

52. Does he work for the same company that you do?

Yes 1 32/y
No 2

---

53. As far as you know what was the highest grade in school he completed?

No formal schooling 1 33/y
8 years or less 2
Some high school 3
High school graduate. 4
Some college 5
College graduate 6
Graduate or professional school 7
Don't know 8

---

54. Does he have any children?

Yes . . .(ASK A). 1 34/y
No . . .(GO TO Q. 55). 2

IF YES: A. Are any of his children in college now?

Yes . . .(ASK B). 1 35/y
No . . .(ASK C). 2
Don't know (ASK C). 3

IF YES TO A: B. What college? 36/y

IF NO OR "DK" TO A: C. Is he definitely planning to send any of his children to college?

Yes 1 37/y
No 2
Don't know 3

Now, let's get back to you.

55. How many children do you have? ____________ 39/y

IF MORE THAN ONE: A. What is the age and sex of each of your children?

		Child 1	Child 2	Child 3	Child 4	Child 5	Child 6
	Age:	____ 40/y	____42/y	____44/y	____46/y	____48/y	____50/y
Sex:	Male	1 41/y	1 43/y	1 45/y	1 47/y	1 49/y	1 51/y
	Female.	2	2	2	2	2	2

---

56. Would you like your youngster who is now in high school to go to college? IF MORE THAN ONE CHILD IN HIGH SCHOOL, ASK ABOUT OLDEST.

BEGIN DECK 4
____
(1-3)

Yes . . . . . (ASK A&B) 1 6/y
No . . . . . (SKIP TO Q. 64) . . . 2
Don't know. . (ASK A&B) 3

IF YES OR "DK": A. If you could pick any college for (him/her), which would you choose? 7/y

B. Are there any colleges you would definitely not want (him/her) to go to? Which? 8/y

---

57. Do you think (he/she) will go to college?

Yes . . . . . (GO TO Q. 58) 1 9/y
No . . . . . (ASK A) 2
Don't know . (GO TO Q. 58) 3

IF NO: A. Why do you think he won't go? RECORD VERBATIM, THEN SKIP TO Q. 64.

10/y

58. Have you made any plans yet to send (him/her) to college?

Yes . . . (ASK A & B)	1	11/y
No . . (GO TO Q. 59)	2	

IF YES: A. HAND RESPONDENT YELLOW CARD. Which of the things listed on the card have actually been done for (him/her)? (PROBE: Have you done anything else that's not listed on the card?)

Talked about it in the family . . .	1	12/R
Talked with neighbors or friends . .	2	13/R
Read catalogues	3	14/R
Visited college(s) . . (ASK [1]) . .	4	15/R
Talked to high school guidance persons	5	16/R
Talked to college admissions representative	6	17/R
Looked for possible scholarship opportunities	7	18/R
Made an application	8	19/R
Anything else (SPECIFY) ____________ ______________________________	9	20/R

IF VISITED COLLEGE(S): (1) Which one(s)?

23/y

B. Who is more active in college planning in your family--you or your wife?

Self	1	24/y
Wife	2	
Equal	3	

---

59. How much do you expect it will cost per year to send (him/her) to college? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES, BUT CIRCLE CODE FOR ANSWER.

Less than $800 . . .	1	25/y
$800 to $1,099 . . .	2	
$1,100 to $1,499 . .	3	
$1,500 to $1,799 . .	4	
$1,800 to $2,299 . .	5	
$2,300 or more . . .	6	
Don't know	7	

60. Have you put away any money especially for this expense--including savings bonds, insurance, and things like that?

Yes . . . (ASK A) 1 26/y
No . . . (GO TO Q. 61) . 2

IF YES: A. About how much would you say that comes to at this point?

$ __________________ 27/y

---

61. As far as you know, what are SAT's?

28/y

---

62. And, what is the College Scholarship Service?

29/y

---

63. And, as far as you know, what is the Illinois State Scholarship Program?

30/y

IF "NO" TO Q. 56 OR Q. 57, ASK Q's 64 AND 65. OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 66.

64. Do you want (him/her) to continue some form of schooling after high school?

Yes . . . (GO TO Q. 65) . 1 31/y
No . . (SKIP TO Q. 66) . 2

---

65. Do you have definite plans for (him/her) for some kind of schooling or training after high school?

Yes . . . (ASK A) 1 32/y
No . . . (ASK B) 2

IF YES: A. What sort of training do you plan for (him/her) to take?

33/y

IF NO: B. What sort of training would you like (him/her) to take?

34/y

I have just a few background questions, and then we'll be through.

66. In what year were you born? ________ 35-36/yy

---

67. A. What is the highest grade in school you completed? CODE IN COLUMN A.

B. And, what is the highest grade in school your wife completed? CODE IN COLUMN B.

C. IF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT NOT OLDEST CHILD: What is the highest grade in school any of your children have completed so far? CODE IN COLUMN C.

	A. Respondent		B. Wife		C. Child	
No formal schooling	1	37/y	1	38/y	1	39/y
8 years or less	2		2		2	
Some high school	3		3		3	
High school graduate	4		4		4	
Some college	5		5		5	
College graduate	6		6		6	
Graduate or professional school	7		7		7	

---

68. A. What was your father's occupation most of his life?

OCCUPATION: ______________________________ (40-42)

INDUSTRY: ______________________________ (43-45)

B. Is that the same occupation he had at the time you got your first full-time job?

Yes . . (GO TO Q. 69). . . .	1	46/y
No . . . . (ASK C).	2	

IF NO TO B: C. What was your father's occupation at that time?

OCCUPATION: ______________________________ (47-49)

INDUSTRY: ______________________________ (50-52)

---

69. What was your father-in-law's occupation most of his life?

OCCUPATION: ______________________________ (53-55)

INDUSTRY: ______________________________ (56-58)

---

70. Does your wife have a full-time job, a part-time job, or doesn't she work outside the home?

Full-time . . (ASK A & B). .	1	59/y
Part-time . . (ASK A & B). .	2	
No job . . (GO TO Q. 71) . .	3	

IF FULL OR PART-TIME JOB: A. What is her occupation?

(60-62)
(63-65)

B. What is her major reason for working?

66/y

NORC
867
10/65

BEGIN DECK 5

____
(1-3)

73. For each statement below circle the code for whether you agree strongly with the statement, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the statement.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	
1. If a child is not doing too well in school, a parent should get a private tutor for extra help or should enroll the child in a private school	1	2	3	4	6/y
2. It is important for a parent to be active in PTA and the like .	1	2	3	4	7/y
3. Going to college is just a status symbol	1	2	3	4	8/y
4. Choosing a college is too complicated for parents to be of much help to their children . .	1	2	3	4	9/y
5. A man who works with his hands is at a disadvantage today . . .	1	2	3	4	10/y
6. Parents should take their children to concerts, plays, and art galleries	1	2	3	4	11/y
7. The most important reason to go to college is to insure getting a good job	1	2	3	4	12/y
8. College educated persons tend to snub their parents	1	2	3	4	13/y
9. A boy can be just as happy without a college education as with one	1	2	3	4	14/y
10. A parent should be willing to go without a new car or vacation to see to it that his child has a college education	1	2	3	4	15/y
11. The most important thing a high school does is teach students to be good citizens and to obey the laws	1	2	3	4	16/y

73--Continued

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	
12. Going to college is too expensive for people like us to be able to afford	1	2	3	4	17/y
13. If a man has a trade he doesn't need to go to college to be happy	1	2	3	4	18/y
14. A parent has the responsibility to read up on colleges so he can help his child make a good choice of college	1	2	3	4	19/y
15. A child would be better off taking a vocational program than a college preparatory program in high school	1	2	3	4	20/y
16. A parent should be willing to borrow money to pay his child's college expenses	1	2	3	4	21/y
17. It is better for a child to be in honors courses than in regular courses in high school.	1	2	3	4	22/y
18. College often puts funny ideas into children's heads	1	2	3	4	23/y
19. If my child didn't like high school, it would be OK with me if he left and got a full-time job	1	2	3	4	24/y
20. If a child has the ability but does not want to go to college, his parents should get him to go anyway	1	2	3	4	25/y
21. Going to college is a waste of time and money for children like mine	1	2	3	4	26/y
22. If a child wants to keep on going to school after high school it is up to him to pay most of the expenses	1	2	3	4	27/y
23. Without a college education it is almost impossible for a person to be successful today .	1	2	3	4	28/y

71. Do you rent this house, or do you own it?

Rent	1	67/y
Own	2	
Other (SPECIFY) ________	3	

---

72. HAND RESPONDENT WHITE CARD. Into which of the groups on this card did the total income for your family fall last year--before taxes?

A.	Under $5,000	0	68/y
B.	$5,000 - $5,999 . . .	1	
C.	$6,000 - $6,999 . . .	2	
D.	$7,000 - $7,999 . . .	3	
E.	$8,000 - $8,999 . . .	4	
F.	$9,000 - $9,999 . . .	5	
G.	$10,000 - $10,999 . .	6	
H.	$11,000 - $11,999 . .	7	
I.	$12,000 - $13,999 . .	8	
J.	$14,000 and over . . .	9	
	Refused (ESTIMATE:)______	X	

Thank you very much. This concludes the questions I have to ask you, but I have here a sheet of questions (HAND RESPONDENT BLUE SHEET) for you to answer by simply circling the code for whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with each statement. This will go much more quickly if you do it yourself than if I would read it to you.

WHEN RESPONDENT HAS FINISHED WITH SELF-ADMINISTERED SHEET, THANK HIM AGAIN FOR HIS COOPERATION, ENTER CASE NUMBER ON BLUE SHEET, AND ATTACH TO QUESTIONNAIRE.

FILL IN THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEAVING RESPONDENT.

ENTER TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: __________ AM PM

Total Length of Interview: _______minutes 69-71/yyy

A. Cooperativeness of respondent:

Very cooperative	1	72/y
Somewhat cooperative . . .	2	
Not cooperative	3	

B. Interest of respondent:

Very interested	1	73/y
Somewhat interested . . .	2	
Not interested	3	

C. Interviewer's Signature: ________________________

D. Date of Interview: ________________

RECORD ANY ADDITIONAL REMARKS ABOUT THIS RESPONDENT ON BACK COVER.

APPENDIX B

STATISTICAL TREATMENT

The hypotheses were tested using nonparametric statistics.[1] At best, the measurements used in this study are ordinal scales and therefore not amenable to standard statistical tests which assume an underlying normal distribution of the variable and a level of measurement as strong as an interval scale. Use of nonparametric statistics does not require either of the assumptions and is therefore appropriate for the data of this study.

Statistics requiring data in nominal form were judged to be adequate for testing these data and three such statistics were chosen. The first was Yule's "Q"[2] which has the following properties: it ranges from -1.00 to 1.00, and attains a value of 0.00 when the attributes are independent; it is a symmetrical measure of association for two dichotomous variables; it is amenable to tests of significance; it can be partialled. The values of Q can be read from a table provided by Davis, Gilman and Schick.[3]

Partialling of Q can be accomplished by what Rosenberg has called test-factor standardization.[1] With this technique the effect of the test variable(s) is held constant by providing each category of the independent variable with a theoretic distribution of the test variable(s), and computing a theoretical table showing what the percentage distribution among categories of the dependent variable would be if there were no associatoon between the independent and the test variables. By dividing the sum of the column marginals for each resulting test factor proportion, then adding the factored cell proportions, a theoretical frequency table can be constructed. Measures of association computed from the "standardized" table indicate the relationships between the independent and dependent variables with the effect of the test factors controlled. The number of test factors which can thus be controlled at one time depends only on the sample size.

---

[1] See Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956) pp. 1-30 for an excellent treatment of the nature of distribution-free statistics.

[2] G. C. Yule, *op. cit.*

[3] James A. Davis, Richard Gilman, Judith Schick, *Tables for Yule's Q Association Coefficient for Pairs of Percentages* (Chicago: The National Opinion Research Center, 1965).

Yule's Q can be tested for significance using Goodman's formula for the variance of Q^2, where

$$S^2_Q = (1-Q^2)^2\left(\frac{1}{A}+\frac{1}{B}+\frac{1}{C}+\frac{1}{D}\right)/4$$

and where A, B, C and D are cell frequencis in a 2 by 2 contigency table. A confidence interval can then be constructed of the following form:

$$C\left(Z_{\frac{1}{2}\alpha}\sqrt{s^2 Q} < Q < Z_{1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha}\sqrt{s^2_Q}\right) = 1-\alpha$$

Thus we can infer the nature of the relationships between any dependent variables, and can measure the different effects on the relationships according to which variables are controlled.

---

[1] Morris Rosenberg, "Test Factor Standardization as a Method of Interpretation," Social Forces, October 1962, pp. 53-61.

[2] Leo A. Goodman, "On the Multivariate Analysis of Three Dichotomous Variables," American Journal of Sociology, LXXI, 1965, pp. 290-301.

The second statistic used was Goodman's Gamma,[1] which is the general statistic of which Yule's Q is a special case. As such it is useful in measuring cross product association in an m by n table. It has the same properties as Q.

The third statistic used has been devised by Coleman.[2] It is an attempt to "carry out multivariate analysis of attribute data which allows expression of the relation in terms of a single parameter for each independent variable."[3] Both dependent and independent variables are dichotomized, having positive and negative states, labeled 1 and 0 to state 1 or vice versa. The transition rate of the dependent variable from state 0 to state 1 is assumed to be composed of contributions of the independent variables in state 1. For an individual who is characterized by X, Y, and Z, for the independent variables, the transition rate q01, xyz of the dependent variable would be q01, x,y,z = $\alpha_x + \alpha_y + \alpha_z + \varepsilon_i$ If any of the attributes were in state 0, the corresponding component of the transition rate would vanish. For purposes of explication a hypothetical table is presented below.

TABLE B-1

$\bar{X}$				X			
$\bar{Y}$		Y		$\bar{Y}$		Y	
$\bar{Z}$	Z	$\bar{Z}$	Z	$\bar{Z}$	Z	$\bar{Z}$	Z
q	q	q	q	q	q	q	q

---

[1] L. A. Goodman and W. Kruskal, "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1954, 49, pp. 732-764.

[2] James S. Coleman, Introduction to Mathematical Sociology. (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964) pp. 189-240.

[3] Coleman, op.cit., p. 191.

In this table X, Y, and Z are independent variables in positive (X,Y,Z) or negative states ($\overline{X},\overline{Y},\overline{Z}$) and each q represents the proportion of the dependent variable in a positive state for each of the 8 combination states of the independent variable.

If C stands for a particular combination of positive states of X,Y, and Z, the effects of a single attribute "i" can be computed as follows

$$a_i = \frac{1}{2^{M-1}} \sum_{C=1}^{2^{M-1}} (q_{ic} - q_c)$$

where m= the number of independent attributes. For small sample sizes each a_i can be weighted by the inverse of the variance of the difference between each q_{ic} and its corresponding q_c. The variance of the difference is of course equal to the sum of the two variances, where each variance is equal to:

$$S^2 q_{ic} = \frac{q_{ic}(1-q_{ic})}{n_{ic}}$$

$$S^2 q_c = \frac{q_c(1-q_c)}{n_c}$$

where n is equal to the cell frequency.

The weighted a_1 is then equal to:

$$a_i' = \frac{1}{\sum W_{ic}} \sum_{C=1}^{2^{M-1}} W_{ic}(q_{ic} - q_c)$$

where W_{1c} is the weight for each q_{ic}.

These weighted effects can then be tested for significance according to the formula:

$$U_i = \frac{\sum_{C=1}^{2^{M-1}} (W_{ic}(q_{ic}-q_c))}{\sqrt{\sum W_{ic}}}$$

The computed value of U_i can then be referred to tables of the cumulative normal distribution.

The individual effects then represent the independent contribution of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The number of independent variables which can be analyzed for effect is restricted only by the sample size, and the weighted effect parameters are not subject to error from small sample sizes.

In the formula given for the transition rate of the dependent variable from state 0 to state 1, the rate was seen to be affected by the independent variables and a parameter, E_i,. This parameter represents random shocks toward and away from the observed positive state of the dependent variable. Thus, for my data, the proportion of respondents with positive attitudes about college-going could be described as resulting from the effects of the respondent's occupation (a_1), his income (a_2), the status of his friend (a_3) and the status of his neighbor (a_4), plus random shocks both toward and away from having positive attitudes. Coleman gives the following formula for the effect of random shocks toward the observed positive state of the dependent variable as (for the four variable case):

$$r_4 = \frac{1}{16}\left(5q_{.} + 3\sum_{i=1}^{4} q_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^{4}\sum_{i=1}^{4} q_{ij} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{4}\sum_{j=i+1}^{4}\sum_{i=1}^{4} q_{ijk} - 3q_{1234}\right)$$

The formula for S_4, the random shocks away from a positive state of the dependent variable, is given as:

$$S_4 = 1 - (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + r_4)$$

Use of the statistics of effect will allow a somewhat more explicit statement of the relative effects of the more powerful independent variables, once these variables are identified through the use of Goodman's Gamma and Yule's Q.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Barber, Bernard. *Social Stratification*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957.

Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Class, Status and Power*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1953.

Berger, Bennet. *Working Class Suburb*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.

Centers, Richard. *The Psychology of Social Classes*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Coleman, James S. *Introduction to Mathematical Sociology*. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Fruchter, B. J. *Introduction to Factor Analysis*. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1954.

Gans, Herbert. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Halpin, Andrew F. and Croft, Don B. *The Organizational Climate of Schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963.

Homans, George C. *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

Jackson, Brian and Marsden, Dennis. *Education and the Working Class*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Kornhauser, Arthur, *et.al*. *When Labor Votes*. New York: University Books, 1956.

Miller, Daniel R. and Swanson, Guy E. *The Changing American Parent*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Rossi, Peter. *Why Families Move*. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Siegel, Sidney. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.

Turner, Ralph. *The Social Context of Ambition*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964.

Walker, Helen M. and Lev, Joseph. *Statistical Inference*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Whyte, William H. Jr. *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Articles and Periodicals

Allport, Gordon W. "The Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology" in *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954, I, 3-56.

Axelrod, Morris. "Urban Structure and Social Participation," *American Sociological Review*, 21 (1956) 16.

Bell, Wendell. "Familism and Suburbanization: One Test of the Social Choice Hypothesis," *Rural Sociology*, 21 (1956) 276-83.

Bell, Wendell, and Force, Maryanne. "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," *American Sociological* Review, 21 (1956) 25-34.

Campbell, Ernest Q., and Alexander, Norman C. "Structural Effects and Interpersonal Relationships," *American Journal of Sociology*, 71 (November 1965) 284-89.

Cartwright, Dorwin and Harary, Frank. "Structural Balance: A Generalization of Heider's Theory," in *Group Dynamics*. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1962. Pp. 705-27.

Cohen, Elizabeth G. "Parental Factors in Educational Mobility," *Sociology of Education*, 38, 5 (Fall 1965) 405.

Curtiss, Richard. "Differential Association and the Stratification of the Urban Community," *Social Forces*, 42, 1, 68-77.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. "Appendix B," in *Occupations and Social Status*. Edited by Albert J. Reiss, Jr. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. "The Trend of Occupational Mobility in the United States," *American Sociological Review*, 30 (1965) 491-98.

Ford, Robert N. "A Rapid Scoring Procedure of Scaling Attitude Questions," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 14 (Fall 1950) 507-32.

Gans, Herbert. "Effects of the Move from City to Suburb," in *The Urban Condition*. Edited by Leonard J. Duhl. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963.

Goodman, Leo A. "On the Multivariate Analysis of Three Dichotomous Variables," *American Journal of Sociology*, 71 (1965) 290-301.

Goodman, Leo A. and Kruskal, Wallace. "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 49 (1954) 732-64.

Holden, David E. W. "Associations as Reference Groups: An Approach to the Problem," Rural Sociology, 30 (1965) 63-74.

Inkeles, Alex. "Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception, and Value," American Journal of Sociology, 66 (1960) 1-31.

Kahl, Joseph. "Educational and Occupational Aspirations of 'Common Man' Boys," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (1953) 186-203.

Kaiser, H. F. "A Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1959, 413-20.

Laumann, Edward O. "Subjective Social Distance and Urban Occupational Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, 71 (1965), 26.

Lockwood, David. "The New 'Working Class'," European Journal of Sociology, 1, 2, 248-59.

Miller, S. M. and Riessman, Frank. "The Working Class Sub-culture: A New View," Social Problems, 9, 1, 86-97.

Riessman, Leonard. "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review. 18, 3 (June 1953), 233-42.

Rosenberg, Morris. "Test Factor Standardization as a Method of Interpretation," Social Forces, October, 1962, 53-61.

Wilensky, Harold. "Work Careers and Social Integration," International Social Science Journal, 12 (1960), 543-60.

Wilson, Alan B. "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, 24 (1959), 836-45.

Wirts, Charles E. "Social Class and Initial Career Choice of College Freshmen," Sociology of Education, 39, 1 (Winter 1966), 74-85.

Yule, G. C. "On Methods of Measuring Association Between Two Attributes," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 75 (1912), 579-642.

Unpublished Materials

Hartley, Raymond E. "On the Logical Foundations of Factor Analysis." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952.

Joiner, Lee M., et. al. "Student Definitions of the Educational Expectations of Others and the Development of Educational Plans: A Longitudinal Study of High School Males." A paper read at the American Educational Research Association meeting, February 18, 1966 at Chicago, Illinois.

King, Gary W. "Selected Patterns of Behavior and Social Characteristics of White Collar and Blue Collar Residents in Three Suburban Subdivisions." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

Reports

Childs, E. Kitch. "A Cookbook: The Calculation of Confidence Limits for Q and G; the Significance of Interactions in G." The National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, 1965.

Coleman, James, Rossi, Peter and Cutright, Phillips. "Determinants and Consequences of College Choice." The National Opinion Research Center and the Department of Social Relations, The Johns Hopkins University, Chicago and Baltimore, 1964.

Davis, James A., Gilman, Richard and Schick, Judith. "Tables for Yule's Q Association Coefficients for Pairs of Percentages." The National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, 1965.

Olson, Philip K. Jr. "Program Number 6.0.145." The IBM General Program Library for the 1620.